The Mennonite Quarterly Review

Volume XXXIII July 1959 Number Three

CONTENTS

EDITORIAL 170

THE LIFE AND TEACHINGS OF HANS HUT *(Part I)* 171
Herbert Klassen

THE DOCTRINE OF ORIGINAL SIN AS HELD BY THE ANABAPTISTS OF THE SIXTEENTH CENTURY 206
Robert Friedmann

JACOB WISLER AND THE OLD ORDER MENNONITE SCHISM OF 1872 IN ELKHART COUNTY, INDIANA *(Concluded)* 215
John C. Wenger

ATTENDANCE IN MENNONITE COLLEGES, 1957-58 241
Silas Hertzler

RESEARCH NOTES 245

I Was a Stranger
John F. Schmidt

An Experimental Evaluation of the Objectives of a Mennonite College
Frank C. Peters

The Commander
William I. Schreiber

Mennonite Plattdeutsch
Cornelius Krahn

BOOK REVIEWS 260

Peter Brock, *The Political and Social Doctrines of the Unity of the Czech Brethren in the Fifteenth and Early Sixteenth Centuries,* and

Thomas Gilby, *Between Community and Society. A Philosophy and Theology of the State*
Reviewed by Paul Peachey

HANS HUT, THE SUBJECT OF A THOROUGH TREATMENT BY HERBERT KLASSEN IN this issue, is the latest of the chief Anabaptist figures of the South to receive the major consideration which he deserves as the great apostle of this region. His career was short, only the sixteen months from May 26, 1526, to September 15, 1527, and his writings few in number and small in compass, but of the extraordinary impact of his truly apostolic ministry there can be no doubt. He was clearly the chief founder of Anabaptism in Southern Bavaria and Austria, the tireless evangelist and founder of churches.

As Klassen shows, due to conflicting or uncertain documentary evidence, some unresolved doubts remain regarding certain aspects of his theology, particularly in the matter of his chiliastic ideas. It is noteworthy, that, if he did for a time preach chiliasm of a mild and spiritual sort, the churches which he established manifested no such ideas. And after some initial wavering his position on nonresistance is completely clear, as his open opposition to Hubmaier at Nikolsburg proves. All his disciples were of the nonrevolutionary and nonresistant type.

ROBERT FRIEDMANN'S THEOLOGICAL ESSAY ON "THE DOCTRINE OF ORIGINAL SIN AS held by the Anabaptists" delivers convincing evidence that the Anabaptists generally held a moderate view on this topic in which the major reformers were thoroughly Augustinian. They rejected the harsh doctrine of total depravity and inherited complete corruption both on scriptural grounds and on their keen sense of the responsibility and capacity of the individual to respond to the divine call to faith and discipleship. They were not Pelagian; they believed and taught the new birth by the grace of God. But they held that by active obedience in co-operation with God's grace and Holy Spirit it is possible to transform all of life. This gave them a certain degree of Christian optimism and hope that stamps them as a distinctive group in the Reformation. The evidence is not yet all in, but Friedmann has assembled an imposing amount of material, and thus far no significant deviation from the position which he outlines has been discovered.

JOHN C. WENGER'S METICULOUSLY THOROUGH AND OBJECTIVE ACCOUNT OF THE Wisler-Old Order Mennonite schism of the 1870's is brought to a conclusion in this issue with the account of the repercussions of Wisler's actions (in Indiana) throughout the Mennonite Church. It is clear that these repercussions were far more extensive than has sometimes been realized, particularly in Ohio. Wisler was not a passive victim of the discipline of his conference; he was an active leader in promoting a conservative schism elsewhere. It is surprising that he did not find a following in Lancaster and Franconia where there must certainly have been much sympathy with his basic position. The reason for this is doubtless to be found in the deep commitment of these areas to the authority of conference, for it must not be forgotten that Wisler was repeatedly dealt with in a regular way by constituted authority, and that his basic error was refusal to accept the discipline imposed upon him not only by his own conference but also by a committee of widely representative bishops.

Wenger's exposure of the sources of division in the rigidity of mind and pettiness of attitude which marked some of the personalities involved is a salutary lesson for all who would violate the unity of the church on any other than clear and indubitably central issues of faith and life.

SILAS HERTZLER'S VALUABLE ANNUAL REPORT ON "ATTENDANCE AT MENNONITE Colleges" reveals no significant new trend for 1957-58, but a steady growth.

The Mennonite Quarterly Review

THE LIFE AND TEACHINGS OF HANS HUT

HERBERT KLASSEN*

I. HUT'S LIFE

1. *The State of Research on Hut*

Although it was early recognized that Hans Hut played a very important role in the spread of Anabaptism in South Germany,[1] no research was done on his life, thought, and influence until Christian Meyer published Hut's confessions in 1874.[2] In 1893 Alexander Nicoladoni threw considerable light on Hut's work in Upper Austria,[3] and in 1901 Friedrich Roth's history of the Reformation in Augsburg carefully analyzed this Anabaptist center and studied Hut's role there.[4] Georg Berbig, in 1903, threw new light on Hut's activities in Franconia,[5] and Paul Wappler in 1913 did the same on his influence in Thuringia.[6]

It was not until 1913 that a detailed study of Hut's life was undertaken. Wilhelm Neuser (d. 1958), writing at the University of Bonn, outlined an ambitious study of his life and thought but completed only a part of his life for a doctoral thesis.[7] Neuser has pieced

* Herbert Klassen, Clearbrook, Manitoba, did his master's thesis at the University of British Columbia on "Some Aspects of the Teachings of Hans Hut (c. 1490-1527)."

1 C. A. Cornelius, *Geschichte des Münsterischen Aufruhrs* (Leipzig, 1855), 42, 49 f.

2 Christian Meyer, "Zur Geschichte der Wiedertäufer in Oberschwaben: I. Die Anfänge des Wiedertäuferthums in Augsburg," *Zeitschrift des Historischen Vereins für Schwaben und Neuburg* I (1874), 207-256; hereafter, *Confessions.*

3 Alexander Nicoladoni, *Johnnes Bünderlin von Linz und die oberösterreichische Täufergemeinde in den Jahren 1525-1531* (Berlin, 1893).

4 Friedrich Roth, *Augsburgs Reformationsgeschichte* I, 1517-1530 (Munich, 1901).

5 Georg Berbig, "Die Wiedertäufer im Amt Königsberg i. Fr. im Jahre 1527/28," *Deutsche Zeitschrift für Kirchenrecht,* XIII, No. 3 (1903), 291-353. Also "Die Wiedertäuferei im Ortslande zu Franken, im Zusammenhang mit dem Bauernkrieg," *ibid,* XXII, No. 3 (1912), 378-403.

6 Paul Wappler, *Die Täuferbewegung in Thüringen von 1526 bis 1584* (Jena, 1913).

7 Wilhelm Neuser, *Hans Hut. Leben und Wirken bis zum Nikolsburger Religionsgespräch* (Berlin, 1913). This volume includes only two of the six chapters that made up the original

together the facts of his life from the sources in a masterly way. His work is limited in its usefulness because it covers only a part of Hut's life, and also due to the fact that most of the sources have since been published in the *Quellen zur Geschichte der Täufer.*[8] A few new sources have turned up since 1913, but nothing that would change the picture to any extent.[9]

In recent research on the South German Anabaptist movement it has become increasingly apparent that a thorough study of the teachings and influence of Hut is necessary.[10] Most scholars have felt that Hut had a negative influence on the South German Anabaptist movement. But Bergsten, on the contrary, studying Pilgram Marpeck and Caspar Schwenkfeld, suggests that Marpeck is greatly indebted to Hut, much more than to Denck.[11] But neither Bergsten nor the many scholars who decry Hut's influence on the Anabaptist movement have attempted to prove their point.

An important aspect of research in Hut's thought is his relationship to Thomas Müntzer. Grete Mecenseffy has suggested that radical revolutionary and eschatological influences crept into the South German Anabaptist movement from Müntzer through Hut.[12] Robert Friedmann suggests that a comparative study of the two men's world view and thought concepts excludes this possibility.[13] Both regret the fact that a thorough and systematic study of the teachings of Hut has not yet been made.

Some of the most recent light on Hut's relationship to the South German Anabaptist movement has come from the newly discovered

thesis. The chapter titles are: (1) Gegenwärtiger Stand der Forschung; (2) Quellenschau; (3) Bis zur Wiedertaufe; (4) Der täuferische Agitator; (5) Hut's Tätigkeit in Thüringen und Franken; (6) Das Nikolsburger Religionsgespräch. Only numbers three and six are published. A typewritten copy of the other chapters is located at the Goshen College Library. Hereafter the references to the typewritten copy will have (MSS) after them.

8 The Verein für Reformationsgeschichte undertook in the 1920's to publish all the Anabaptist source materials available in German archives. The following volumes were used in this study: (1) Karl Schornbaum, ed., *Quellen zur Geschichte der Wiedertäufer: Markgraftum Brandenburg, Bayern,* I (Leipzig, 1934), in *Quellen und Forschungen zur Reformationsgeschichte,* XVI, Part 2; hereafter, *Bayern* I. (2) Lydia Müller, ed. *Glaubenszeugnisse oberdeutscher Taufgesinnter* I (Leipzig, 1938), in *Quellen und Forschungen zur Reformationsgeschichte,* XX; hereafter, *Glaubenszeugnisse* I. (3) Karl Schornbaum, ed., *Quellen zur Geschichte der Täufer: Bayern* II (Gütersloh, 1951), in *Quellen und Forschungen zur Reformationsgeschichte,* XXIII. Hereafter, *Bayern* II. A second volume of *Glaubenszeugnisse* edited by Lydia Müller and Robert Friedmann was available in typewritten manuscript at the Goshen College Library. Hereafter, *Glaubenszeugnisse* II, with the number of the tract and (MSS) after the page reference.

9 One of Hut's confessions that Meyer missed has been printed in *Bayern* I, 41-44.

10 Jan J. Kiwiet, "The Life of Hans Denck," *MQR* XXXI (1957), 227-259; *idem,* "The Theology of Hans Denck," *MQR* XXXII (1958), 3-27; *idem, Pilgram Marbeck, Ein Führer in der Täuferbewegung der Reformationszeit* (Kassel, 1957); hereafter, Kiwiet, *Denck,* and Kiwiet, *Marpeck.*

11 Torsten Bergsten, "Pilgram Marbeck und seine Auseinandersetzung mit Caspar Schwenkfeld," *Kyrkohistorisk Arsskrift* (1957), 1-58 Only the page proofs were available.

12 Grete Mecenseffy, "Die Herkunft des oberösterreichischen Täufertums," *Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte* XLVII, No. 2 (1956), 252-258.

13 Robert Friedmann, "Thomas Müntzer's Relation to Anabaptism," *MQR* XXXI (1957), 75-87.

Kunstbuch,[14] in which one of Hut's major writings appears along with many other South German Anabaptist tracts. All of these tracts and epistles reflect Hut's influence, as Heinold Fast has pointed out.[15] The omissions and additions that were obviously made in editing Hut's tract in the *Kunstbuch* throw considerable new light on the development of thought among South German Anabaptists. In the course of a generation after his death, Hut's insights were sharpened and modified as the character of the opposition to Anabaptism changed, but his basic position was not significantly altered.

2. *Trends in Research on Anabaptism in General*

There has been a tremendous increase in serious Anabaptist research in the last generation.[16] This has been stimulated by the new problems that the Church has had to face in the twentieth century and facilitated by the publication of the original source materials.[17] Two important trends can be noted in reviewing this research. First, most of the energies have of necessity been consumed in gathering and organizing the historical facts. Only very recently have attempts been made to grapple with the thought and theology of the Anabaptists.[18] It is generally recognized that the task of the new generation of Anabaptist scholars will lie in this area. Secondly, most of the energies of the Anabaptist scholars of the past generation have been devoted to the study of the Dutch Mennonites, the Swiss Brethren, and the Hutterian Brethren. Only very recently has the South German Anabaptist movement been recognized as a semi-independent development with certain points of distinctive theology. Jan Kiwiet has pioneered this view in his studies on Denck and Marpeck.[19] The *Kunstbuch* has also added to the view that the South

14 Jörg Maler, ed., *Das Kunstbuch* (manuscript, 1561). This manuscript codex of ca. 740 pages was discovered in 1955 in the Burgerbibliothek at Bern, Switzerland, by Dr. Heinold Fast and Dr. J. F. C. Goeters. It contains, in addition to certain minor items, 42 letters and documents of 1527-1555, largely from the Pilgram Marpeck South German Anabaptist brotherhood. A typewritten copy prepared by Samuel Geiser is located at the Goshen College Library; hereafter cited as *Kunstbuch*, with Geiser's pagination.

15 Heinold Fast, "Pilgram Marbeck und das oberdeutsche Täufertum. Ein neuer Handschriftenfund," *ARG, ibid.* (1956), 212-241.

16 See the article on "Historiography," in the *Mennonite Encyclopedia* II (1956), 751-769; Littell, *op cit.*, particularly Chapter I, "Former Treatments of Anabaptism," pp. 1-18, and Chapter II, "The Quest for the Essence of Anabaptism," pp. 19-49. A list of 62 doctoral dissertations relating to Anabaptist and Mennonite history written since World War II was prepared for the Mennonite World Conference meeting at Karlsruhe in 1957, and will appear in the published proceedings

17 For those not described above in footnote 8, see the introduction to Manfred Krebs, ed., *Quellen zur Geschichte der Täufer; Baden und Pfalz* (Gütersloh, 1951), in *Quellen und Forschungen zur Reformationsgeschichte,* XXI.

18 See Littell, *op. cit.;* Frank Wray, "History in the Eyes of the Sixteenth Century Anabaptists" (unpublished Ph. D. dissertation, Yale, 1953); Hans Hillerbrand, "Die politische Ethik des oberdeutschen Täufertums" (unpublished Ph. D. dissertation, University of Erlangen, 1957); John Howard Yoder, "Das Schweizerische Täufertum in Gespräch mit der Reformation," a typewritten companion volume to his Basel dissertation now in process of publication; Heinold Fast, "Heinrich Bullinger und die Täufer (unpublished Th. D. dissertation, University of Heidelberg, 1957).

19 See footnote 10.

German Anabaptist movement must be studied as a phenomenon not synonymous with the Swiss Brethren and the Hutterites.

A study of Hans Hut must be closely related to these two trends. It must first of all be a study of his thought and influence rather than merely an historical account of his life. This means that the categories of religious and intellectual history must be applied and that Hut must be seen against the thought of his contemporaries. Since Hut was the cofounder[20] of the South German Anabaptist movement it will at the same time be a study in the origins of this movement as over against the Swiss beginnings, and as a background for the movement in Moravia.

3. *The Writings and Confessions of Hut*

Of Hut's literary efforts only two tracts, a letter, and a small concordance have become known, besides some hymns of lasting value. *Ein christlicher Unterricht* (A Christian Instruction) was published by Johannes Landtsperger in 1527.[21] The main part was republished in *Mittheilungen aus dem Antiquariat S. Calvary,* in 1871.[22] This tract contains a list of forty contradictory Scripture references. Thirty-nine of the forty appear in an earlier work by Denck. If they were inserted by Hut it demonstrates a clear reliance on Denck.[23] The writing itself is an interpretation of the three major sections of the Apostolic Creed.

There are no extant copies of Hut's tract *Vom Geheimnis der Tauff* (The Mystery of Baptism) except as they appear in numerous Hutterite codices. It is believed to be identical with the "book with the seven seals" that Hut refers to at his trial in November 1527.[24] Both of the above named tracts appear in several Hutterite manuscript books, and both were published by Lydia Müller in 1938.[25] *Vom Geheimnis der Tauff,* except for the last part and a number of other omissions, appeared in the *Kunstbuch* of 1561. Both tracts were written sometime between Hut's baptism in May 1526 and his imprisonment in September 1527, most probably early in this period.

The open letter which Hut wrote to the Anabaptist brotherhood was probably written in Augsburg in August 1527. When it came into the hands of Urbanus Rhegius in Augsburg he replied in 1528 with a pamphlet, *Sendbrief Hans Huthen etwan ains Fuernemen*

20 This does not mean necessarily complete independence of the South German movement from the Swiss, either in origin or in subsequent history.

21 See Karl Schottenloher, *Philip Ulhart. Ein Augsburger Winkeldrucker und Helfershelfer der "Schwärmer" und "Widertäufer," 1523-1529* (Munich, 1921), 60-64.

22 Berlin, 1869, 156-166.

23 They appear in Hut in *Glaubenszeugnisse* I, pp. 29-31; and in Denck in Walter Fellmann, ed., *Hans Denck Schriften, 2. Teil, Religiöse Schriften* (Götersloh, 1956), 56-74; hereafter, Fellmann, *Denck.*

24 "Das buch mit den syben sigeln" (*Confessions,* 240).

25 *Glaubenszeugnisse* I, 12-37.

Vorsteers im Wiedertaufforden. Verantwortet durch Urbanum Rhegium (Epistle of Hans Hut, an outstanding Leader in the Anabaptist order, answered by Urbanus Rhegius).[26] Lydia Müller again his printed the main section of the epistle.[27] It is a short document and it is believed to have been sent with Anabaptist apostles commissioned by the Martyr Synod.

The *Rathsbüchlein* containing a short catechism, prayer, and a concordance of 78 items was found in the possession of Eitelhans Langenmantel when he was arrested and is commonly attributed to Hut. It was published by Friedrich Roth without the Scripture references in a study of Hans Langenmantel.[28]

The confessions of Hut all date from the time of his imprisonment in Augsburg. Ten records of his answers to the court inquiry have been published in Meyer's study,[29] and one more appears in Schornbaum's collection of Anabaptist source materials for Bavaria.[30]

The confessions of friends and followers of Hut that throw most light on his teachings have been printed in Berbig, Wappler, Nicoladoni, and Schornbaum.[31] The influence of Hut on other South German Anabaptist leaders can be traced best in Müller's two volumes of South German tracts and epistles.[32]

4. *The Problem*

In the study of Hut's teachings it will be necessary to review what his contemporaries, friendly and hostile, thought of him, and examine the verdict of history and the problem it presents.

It seems very clear that the sentence which the court at Augsburg passed on Hut in 1527 powerfully influenced the position of later writers concerning him. The sentence accuses him specifically of holding infant baptism in contempt, of raising up a league to overthrow the authorities, and in general of heresy, revolution, and sedition. He was further accused of claiming special revelations from God, participating in the Peasants' War, inciting the common man to annihilate the authorities, associating with Müntzer, leading the pious citizens of Mühlhausen and Franconia astray and, while in prison, attempting to strangle his guard in an effort to escape by violence.[33]

26 See Christian Neff, "Urbanus Rhegius," *Mennonitisches Lexikon*, III (1958), 486-487.
27 *Glaubenszeugnisse* I, 12.
28 Friedrich Roth, "Zur Geschichte der Wiedertäufer in Oberschwaben. II. Zur Lebensgeschichte Eitelhans Langenmantels von Augsburg," *Zeitschrift des Historischen Vereins für Schwaben und Neuburg* XXVII (1900), 38-40.
29 *Confessions*, 223-245.
30 *Bayern* I, 41-44.
31 See above, footnotes 3, 5, 6, 8.
32 *Glaubenszeugnisse* I and II.
33 *Confessions*, 252 f.

Sebastian Franck was one of the first to interpret Hut in this negative light, considering him the founder of a new sect that wanted to annihilate the ungodly and encouraged community of goods and of women.[34] Schwenckfeld was of the same opinion.[35] Most Roman Catholic and Protestant writers condemned Hut as dangerous. Johannes Faber, a Catholic historian, for example, called him an archheretic and lying fraud,[36] and Sender, a priest, revived the superstition about a flask which bewitched those who drank from it and caused them to join the Anabaptist movement.[37] Although Kessler was not antagonistic he did accuse Hut of dating the coming of Christ, teaching that the pious would eradicate the ungodly with the sword, and implying that the devil would ultimately be saved.[38]

More systematic than all these was Heinrich Bullinger's condemnation of Hut.[39] He dedicated a whole chapter in his last and final book of 1560 on the Anabaptists to a refutation of Hut and his followers. Revolution, special revelations, and apocalyptic indifference to property are all refuted. Neuser (writing in 1913) pointed out that Wigand, Ottius, Arnold, B. N. Krohn, G. A. Will, Heller, Hagin, Ritschl, Linden, Hegler, and Köhler all follow Bullinger with minor modifications.[40] Friedrich Rödel,[41] Lowell Zuck,[42] Norman Cohn,[43] and a host of other scholars have followed Bullinger as well since 1913. But in the light of Fast's study of Bullinger and the Anabaptists it is no longer possible to accept Bullinger's position uncritically.[44]

Not until Meyer's study of 1874 was the positive interpretation of Hut by the *Geschichtbuch*[45] and the *Martyr's Mirror*[46] once more picked up. It is his opinion that after Hut's baptism his teaching was of all Anabaptists the most honorable and moderate.[47] Keller,[48] Nic-

34 Sebastian Franck, *Chronica, Zeytbuch vnd Geschycht Bibel von Anbegyn bisz inn disz Gegenwertig M.D.xxxj. Jar* (Strassburg, 1531), 444b, 449b f.

35 In K. Ecke, *Schwenkfeld, Luther und der Gedanke einer apostolischen Reformation* (Berlin, 1911), 205 f.

36 Neuser, *op. cit.*, 2 (MSS).

37 *Ibid.*

38 Emil Egli and Rudolph Schoch, *Johannes Kesslers Sabbata* (St. Gall, 1902), 272 f.

39 Heinrich Bullinger, *Der Widertoeufferen vrsprung/ Fürgang/ Secten/ Waesen/ Fürnemen vnd Gemeine jrer leer Artickel* (Zürich, 1561), 42b-44a.

40 Neuser, *op. cit.*, 3 f. (MSS).

41 Friedrich Rödel, "Die anarchischen Tendenzen bei den Wiedertäufern des Reformationszeitalters. Dargestellt auf Grund ihrer Obrigkeitsanschauung," (unpublished Ph. D. dissertation, University of Erlangen, 1950), 44 f.

42 Lowell H. Zuck, "Anabaptist Revolution through the Covenant in Sixteenth Century Continental Protestantism" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Yale, 1954), 64 f.

43 Norman Cohn, *The Pursuit of the Millennium. A History of Popular Religions and Social Movements in Europe from the Eleventh to the Sixteenth Century* (London, 1957), 275.

44 Fast, *op. cit.*, 206-211.

45 Josef Beck, ed., *Die Geschichts-Bücher der Wiedertäufer in Oesterreich-Ungarn* (Vienna, 1883), 22, 34, 35.

46 Thieleman J. van Braght, *The Bloody Theater or Martyrs' Mirror* (Scottdale, 1951), 433. The first edition was published in the Netherlands in 1660.

47 Meyer, *op. cit.*, 218.

48 Ludwig Keller, *Ein Apostel der Wiedertäufer* (Leipzig, 1882), 41 f.

oladoni,[49] and Hartmann[50] have followed Meyer and continued this interpretation.

The sharp difference of opinion on Hut is not accidental, however, or unjustified, for on most questions of his teaching there is strongly contradictory evidence, both in the writings of others who knew him and in his own. It is therefore imperative to weigh the evidence very carefully, even though it is most probably that some of the contradictions will never be resolved unless new sources are found. This presents the greatest problem in the study of Hut's teachings.

5. *Purpose and Plan*

The major task in these articles is to determine in as far as the sources permit what Hut taught concerning church and state. In order to do this a brief sketch of his life will be made relying as far as necessary on the work done by Neuser. After a systematic presentation of his teachings, in which the contradictions will be stated and the weighing begun, it will be necessary to consider two divergent major influences on his life, that of Thomas Müntzer and that of Hans Denck. What is then known about Hut will be related to the writings and influence of other leaders of the South German Anabaptist movement. In the light of this, conclusions will be drawn about the problem of church and state in the life of Hans Hut and his associates.

6. *A Brief Sketch of Hut's Life*

The Peasant's Revolt of 1524-1525 caught the imagination of a large proportion of the German population. When the peasants saw their hopes suddenly shattered and themselves violently suppressed, a wave of disappointment spead over the masses. The apocalyptic dreams of the Zwickau prophets and of Thomas Müntzer had not materialized. The imminent change they had promised, viz., the purging of the world through the annihilation of the ungodly and the beginning of a new Golden Age of righteousness, had come to naught. But once this one hope was crushed, the theme of the Turks as being the judgment of God upon the ungodly and the authorities was once more picked up with renewed vigor.[51]

Hans Hut more than anyone else in the few years after 1525 was responsible for fanning the dying embers of hope in Franconia, Bavaria, and Austria and channeling them into new directions. The time of his greatest activity and widest influence is divided into two

49 Nicoladoni, *op. cit.*, 22, footnote 2.
50 Neuser, *op. cit.*, 5 (MSS).
51 Wappler, *op. cit.*, 26 f.

periods by his baptism on May 26, 1526. The first period begins with the defeat of the peasants at Frankenhausen in March 1525 and finds Hut primarily under the influence of Müntzer. The second period comes to an end with Hut's death in Augsburg on December 6, 1527, and is characterized by his identification with the Anabaptist movement.

Hans Hut was a native of Haina near Römhild in Thuringa.[52] For four years after 1517, he was a sexton in the service of the knights Hans and George von Bibra of Schwebenheim in the village of Bibra near Memmingen. From about 1521 on, his work as a bookbinder and book salesman took him to Würzburg, Bamberg, Nürnberg, Passau, and to Austria.[53] In the early twenties much of this work of selling and distributing pamphlets contributed to the propagation of the evangelical Lutheran faith. His interest in the new religious awakening often took him to Wittenberg where he attended the church services and lectures of the Reformers. These trips also brought him into contact with current radical ideas.

Sometime during the course of 1524 Hut met three craftsmen at Weissenfels with whom he discussed the necessity of infant baptism.[54] Since the Wittenberg theologians were not able to help him in this matter,[55] and since he was troubled by such Scripture passages as Matthew 28:20, Mark 16:16, and Acts 19:3, he refused to have his next child baptized, insisting that if Christ and the apostles did not baptize children it might be best to postpone baptism until children had acquired understanding about the Christian life and the sufferings that accompany it.[56]

When it became known in Bibra that he refused to have his child baptized, the lords of Bibra ordered a disputation and at the same time demanded that he have his child baptized within eight days or sell his property and move out.[57] The decision to comply with the latter alternative was an important one in Hut's life, for it was the beginning of a series of steps that led him into the hands of the Anabaptists. After a short imprisonment he left Bibra with his wife and five children, and in the summer of 1524 began a life of wandering. Some of his time in the fall of 1524 he spent in Nürnberg, where he met and stayed with Hans Denck[58] and Wolfgang Vogel, pastor

52 Along with Neuser, *op. cit.*, see also J. Hartmann, "Hut," *Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie*, XIII (1881); S. Hegler, "Hut," *Realenzyklopädie für protestantische Theologie und Kirche* (3 ed.) VIII (1900); Walther Köhler, "Hut," *Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart* III (1912); W. Wiswedel, *Bilder und Führergestalten aus dem Täufertum* (3. ed., Kassel, 1929), 125-136; Johann Loserth and Robert Friedmann, "Hut," *ME* II (1956).

53 *Confessions*, 245.

54 *Confessions*, 223 f. Cf. Fast, *ARG*, 217, footnote 21.

55 *Confessions*, 224:7.

56 *Confessions*, 250.

57 *Confessions*, 250:11.

58 *Confessions*, 229:6, 230:9.

at Eltersdorf. Hut probably had access through these men to the meetings of the radical humanists of Nürnberg who were an active group until the trials of January 1525 that finally led to Denck's banishment.[59]

In the spring of 1525, while peddling his books between Wittenberg and Erfurt, Hut became involved in the Peasants' Revolt. In the hope of selling some of his books and pamphlets he made his way to Frankenhausen, where he heard Müntzer preach on a number of days before the battle of May 27, 1525. On the day of the battle he accompanied the troops, but when his life was endangered he fled to safety. He was taken captive once by the Peasant forces but released at the command of Müntzer, and again by the conquerors after the battle, only to be freed again, probably because he was peddling Reformation tracts.[60] Müntzer knew Hut because he had visited him at Bibra early in the summer of 1524, at which time he left his exposition of the first chapter of Luke and Hut arranged to have it printed.

In June 1525 Hut was preaching in much the same spirit as Müntzer in Bibra. Here he was invited by the pastor Jörg Haug von Juchsen to speak on the subject of baptism.[61] According to his own account he spoke on baptism, the Lord's Supper, ungodliness, and the mass,[62] and preached open revolt against the authorities.[63] Hut was not able to remain in Bibra long, and soon resumed the life of a wandering agitator. Where he spent his time between June 1525 and his appearance in Augsburg in May 1526 is not clear.

Hut's brief visit in Augsburg on Pentecost of 1526 became a turning point in his life. He stayed with his old friend Hans Denck, who had been baptized by Balthasar Hubmaier in March of the same year. With Denck was a friend, Caspar Ferber, who had also been baptized and told of the spiritual revival among those rebaptized in the Inntal.[64] Hut says that he had not heard of baptism for adults previously and had no desire to be baptized; but having been persuaded by Denck and Ferber he allowed Denck to baptize him on May 26, 1526.

After his baptism, Hut left Augsburg for Franconia and Thuringia, now eagerly winning people for the Anabaptist cause. It is impossible to trace his activities accurately but a certain amount of

59 Kiwiet, *Denck*, 236 f.
60 Neuser, *op. cit.*, 22.
61 A tract of his is printed in *Glaubenszeugnisse* I, pp. 3-10. It is dated 1524 and manifests a spirit that has much more in common with Hut than with Müntzer. Dr. Robert Friedmann has suggested in a letter that Jörg Haug may have been the first one after hte battle of Frankenhausen to direct Hut into moderate and peaceful paths.
62 *Confessions*, 251.
63 *Confessions*, 249, 251.
64 *Confessions*, 224, 245. Fast believes that the reference here should be to the Swiss Anabaptists and not to the Inntal (*ARG*, 217, footnote 30). Unless some new sources turn up I am inclined to agree with Fast.

chronology and geography are supplied by the sources from the areas in which he preached.[65]

It seems that Hut began his Anabaptist activities at a mill near his birthplace Haina, where the miller and his brother were baptized by Hut early in the summer of 1526. More important for the spread of the movement was the baptism of Jörg Volck of Haina, who thereafter accompanied Hut on his travels in Franconia. From Haina his work spread out into neighboring territories and he was soon baptizing followers in Römhild, Breitensee, Gross-Walbur, Klein-Walbur, and Coburg. In Gross-Walbur he won Kilian Volckaimer, and in Coburg Eukarius Kellermann took up the Anabaptist faith. These two men together with the latter's servant, Joachim Mertz, accompanied Hut on most of his missionary journeys.[66]

In the fall of 1526 Hut traveled to Königsberg (Franconia) with his companions, and gathered a small congregation. Hut gives a rather detailed account of a sermon he preached here.[67] The passages from Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments and the Apocrypha all relate either to the final judgment or to the sword. It is not always clear whether the position he took was revolutionary or peaceful. He did say that the peasants were wrong in rising up against the authorities and that swords should be left in their sheaths until commanded otherwise by God, who would soon return to judge the ungodly. The righteous would be given authority to reign, rule, and judge over the ungodly and God would overthrow all authority and power and bring the world to an end.

Hut also made excursions into the neighboring countryside with his companions. In Ostheim Thoman Spiegel was won for the cause, and a small Anabaptist group grew up here. In preaching that God was bringing the world to a sudden end, Hut apparently assured his listeners that before the end the Turks would invade Europe, overthrow the authorities, and destroy countless multitudes. Christians should flee to Mülhausen, Nürnberg, and Hungary, for God would wipe out the Turks and all that remained save for those who had been rebaptized. At the Aurachsmühle Hut preached for three days with great success, whereas in Leutershausen no one received the "covenant." In Unfinden and Mechenried Hut again preached and baptized freely.[68]

Leaving Jörg Volck to carry on the work in Königsberg, Hut

65 The only full account of Hut's activities in Franconia, Thuringia, and at Nikolsburg is in Neuser's thesis. I have documented the account from recently published source materials where I felt it was necessary. See footnotes 7 and 8.

66 Neuser, *op. cit.*, 47 f. (MSS).

67 *Confessions*, 241 f.

68 Neuser, *op. cit.*, 50-53 (MSS).

left this area sometime in November 1526, planning to pass through Nürnbeg on his way to Augsburg. He passed over Zilgendorf to Uetzing where he baptized Mertain and Veit Weischenfelder along with a number of others. Hut's preaching here was of a peaceful nonresistant variety.[69] The congregation soon grew to the point where a common purse had to be instituted; the message also spread into the surrounding villages. A large gathering met at the Hopfenmühle just before Christmas of 1526.[70] Hans Weischenfelder's report of this meeting indicates that Hut was preaching revolutionary doctrine. Mertain, on the other hand, says that Hut never preached anything revolutionary.

Shortly after this meeting Hut left to pass on to Nürnberg and Augsburg, but this time by way of Bamberg and Erlangen. Hut made his way to Bamberg in the company of Eukarius Kellermann, Joachim Mertz, Endres Ryss, Hans Weischenfelder, Sebastian, Thoman Spiegel, Jörg Volck, and Kilian Volckaimer. After a short unsuccessful stay in Bamberg the group went on to Erlangen, lodging in the home of Hans Nadler, who received baptism with his wife. Soon there was a congregation of some thirty Anabaptists here. In a short time word spread to Alterlangen, where Marx and Michel Maier entered the covenant brotherhood. Sometime around Shrove Tuesday (Fastnacht) Hut appeared in Uttenreut. The message Hut proclaimed here was of a very moderate variety.[71] After preaching repentance and forgiveness of sins, Hut baptized about twelve persons and closed with the celebration of the Lord's Supper. The same night Hut moved on never to return, but behind him he left a small Anabaptist congregation.

A similar series of events took place in Eltersdorf, where the pastor Wolfgang Vogel joined the Anabaptist brotherhood. In early February 1527 Hut left his companions and travelled on to Nürnberg, planning to meet them at Erlangen on Sunday, February 17. In Nürnberg Hut worked at his trade for some time while propagating the Anabaptist faith during the evening. But he was not able to remain here long. News of the discovery and persecution of Anabaptists in the Königsberg area soon spread down to Nürnberg. Hut left, but in the meantime Vogel was placed on trial, Spiegel was imprisoned, and the authorities in Bamberg and Coburg and throughout many parts of Franconia were notified and alerted. After a long series of trials Vogel was finally accused of revolutionary intentions and heresy and was decapitated on March 26, 1527. None of the

69 *Ibid.*, 57.
70 *Ibid.*, 59.
71 *Ibid.*, 62.

charges placed against him are reflected in the lengthy confession we have from his hand.[72] At Erlangen the Maier brothers, Hans Nadler, and others escaped before they were imprisoned.

In the meantime Hut spent nine to ten days in Augsburg.[73] He arrived at just the right time to establish the Anabaptist congregation here on a solid footing. Hut baptized Eitelhans Langenmantel and his servants Hermann Anwalt and Margarethe, also Sigmund Salminger,[74] Konrad Huber, Gall Fischer and his wife, Peter Scheppach and his wife, and the wife of Georg Regel. Hut's zeal attracted men from all classes of society. The congregation grew rapidly to the point where a treasury for the poor had to be organized. Before Hut left, Sigmund Salminger was chosen as leader, and two assistants, Jakob Dachser[75] and Jakob Gross,[76] were appointed.

After his work in Augsburg was accomplished it was Hut's intention to return to Erlangen, but since the authorities were now hot on his trail, return was impossible. Hut then decided to visit the Anabaptists in Moravia with his companions Eukarius von Coburg, Joachim Mertz, and Hans Weischenfelder. Early in April 1527 the four wandering apostles turned in at Passau, where they were received by Georg Nespitzer, the brother-in-law of Eukarius Kellermann. His interest in the new doctrines had been aroused earlier, and when Hut arrived and read to him from the Old and New Testaments he and his wife were baptized and received into the covenant of the Lord. Hut explained that the covenant consists of a readiness to forsake one's sins and a willingness to discipline one's brother when he sins, and to help him in time of need.[77] Hut remained here until April 21, and then continued to Moravia with Eukarius and Joachim as well as Georg Nespitzer and his wife.[78] Hans Weischenfelder stayed behind to tend the flock at Passau.

At Nikolsburg the Anabaptist cause was flourishing. Balthasar Hubmaier had been there about a year preaching Anabaptist doctrines. Leonhard, Lord of Liechtenstein, had joined the movement, and a multitude of men and women had been baptized into the faith.[79] Nadler reports that up to seventy were baptized in one day.[80]

Shortly before Hut arrived trouble had begun in the congregation when a group led by Jacob Widemann began calling for com-

72 Wiswedel, *Bilder* I, 152-169.
73 *Confessions*, 224.
74 See Schottenloher, *op cit.*, 81-83.
75 *Ibid.*, 72-81. He attributes the tract, *Ein Göttlich vnd Grüntlich Offenbarung: von den wahrhaftigen Widerteuffern 1527* (Augsburg: Ulhart, 1527) to Jacob Dachser. It had earlier been attributed to Eitelhans Langenmantel.
76 Roth, *Augsburgs Reformationsgeschichte* I, 224-39.
77 Neuser, *op. cit.*, 29 f. (MSS).
78 Nicoladoni, *op. cit.*, 207:17.
79 Beck, *op. cit.*, 48.
80 *Bayern* I, 132.

munity of goods and rejection of the sword in every form. The latter point was crucial at this time in Austria, since the Turkish threat made the payment of a wartax compulsory as well as military service. Widemann maintained that government and the Spirit of Christ could not mix and that a Christian could under no circumstances use the sword. Hubmaier opposed this flatly, and maintained that under all circumstances obedience to the authorities is obligatory.[81]

When Hut arrived in Nikolsburg he was forced into this debate. He sided with Widemann, believing that the Christian must suffer patiently under the authorities until God would bring the world to an end; this meant that Hut's weight in the debate went to the *Stäbler* rather than to the *Schwertler*.[82] Hans Schlaffer's account however, shows that this was not the only point of conflict between Hubmaier and Hut.[83] Antagonism also centered in the ease with which members were accepted into the brotherhood. The church at Nikolsburg under Hubmaier, as at Waldshut, lacked some of the Anabaptist voluntarism in the matter of baptism and church membership. The subject matter of the discussions between Hubmaier and Hut is difficult to determine. Nadler suggests that Hut's Seven Articles[84] were up for debate; since he was not present his word alone is not reliable.[85] It is, however, substantiated by George Nespitzer, who also reports that the Seven Articles of Hut were debated.[86] Hut, on the other hand, says in his confessions that Hubmaier set up a list of articles against him and lists eleven of them.[87] Hut denied all but one of them, and when it appeared that he would be imprisoned on account of them he fled. Neither the eleven articles that Hubmaier is supposed to have formulated nor Hut's Seven Articles have anything to do with the question of the wartax and the sword. It is now clear that the Anabaptists were not responsible for the notorious Nikolsburg Articles[88] that Hut has so long been accused of supporting. If Hubmaier raised 52 articles, as Hut suggests, it is possible that the questions regarding the sword and concerning the three and one-half years of the Prophet Daniel were among them.[89]

From Nikolsburg Hut made his way to Vienna with Oswald Glait,[90] arriving there early in June 1527. While they were in Vien-

81 See Paul Dedic, "Nikolsburg," *ME* III (1957), 883-886.
82 *Ibid.*, p. 884. Hubmaier's followers were called the group of the "sword" and Widemann's the group of the "staff."
83 *Glaubenszeugnisse* I, 123.
84 See Appendix II.
85 *Bayern* I, 153.
86 *Ibid.*, 194.
87 *Confessions*, 232.
88 See W. Wiswedel, "Nikolsburg, Articles of," *ME* III (1957), 886-888.
89 Hubmaier protested against the application of the three and a half years to the present. See C. Sachsse, *Doctor Balthasar Hubmaier als Theologe* (Berlin, 1914), 401.
90 Wilhelm Wiswedel, "Oswald Glait von Jamnitz," *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte*, Third series VII, Vol. LVI, No. 4 (1937), 550-564.

na fifty converts were baptized. The most important of them was Leonhard Schiemer, who reports that after hearing Hut preach for two days and finding nothing evil in it he accepted baptism from Oswald Glait.[91]

From Vienna Hut proceeded on to Melk, where he is said to have baptized fifteen persons. At Steyr, Hut was introduced into the company of respected citizens by Jakob Portner, the chaplain of Count Regendorf. Leonhard Dorfbrunner, a former priest and chaplain at Pechlarn, was baptized here with a number of others. Hut escaped just before the whole group was arrested. Several were executed, a number were expelled, and only those who recanted were released. At Freistadt and Gallneukirchen Hut baptized about twenty persons. At Linz, Ambrosius Spittelmeyer, a university student, and a number more were baptized. Linz became the center of the Anabaptist movement in Upper Austria after the congregation at Steyr was broken up in the 1540's. Wolfgang Brandhuber and Hans Schlaffer spearheaded the Anabaptist movement here and in the environment. From Linz, Hut passed on through Schärding, Braunau, Laufen, and Salzburg on his way to Augsburg.[92]

Hut arrived in Augsburg in time for a gathering of Anabaptist leaders that has been described as the Martyr Synod. Because it was of a spontaneous character without official leadership it is probably inaccurate to refer to it as a synod, and yet to deny that there was an important meeting of Anabaptist leaders and a great missionary sending out of apostles, is contrary to fact. The two most influential leaders in attendance were Hans Denck and Hans Hut. Whereas it had until recently been taken for granted that Denck played the most important role, it is now generally agreed that Hut was the dominant personality. Since Denck was not very active as an Anabaptist in baptizing, commissioning leaders, and founding new congregation, it is reasonably safe to assume that Hut took the initiative in calling the meeting and served as leader at its sessions. According to Georg Nespitzer[93] and Marx Maier,[94] the major meeting at which the commissioning was done took place on August 24, 1527, in the home of Mattias Finder. A meeting had been held a few days earlier in the home of Gall Vischer, the deacon of the Augsburg Anabaptist congregation. A third meeting at the home of the other deacon, Konrad Huber, was probably not attended by Denck.

The central theological problem discussed was probably Hut's

91 *Glaubenszeugnisse* I, 80.
92 Loserth and Friedmann, *ME* II, 848.
93 *Bayern* I, 187.
94 *Ibid.*, 199.

eschatology. Walter Fellman suggests wrongly that there was general agreement on fixing the date of the return of Christ at 1528.[95] Hut and most of the disciples he influenced stated that the date of the return of Christ is unknown. Although the note of eschatological urgency and the constant threat of the Turks formed the basic setting for Hut's theology, it seems clear that if he ever taught that the end of the world would come in 1528 he had abandoned this position by the summer of 1527. All the disciples from his Austrian ministry denied that Hut ever taught a revolutionary chiliasm and a fixing of the time at which God would culminate history. The problem created by those that say he did remains, but this must be weighed against his own testimony and that of his closest and most influential disciples.

Hut remained in Augsburg after the Synod and was arrested on September 15,1527, and tried for the first time a day later. The available confessions indicate that he was put on trial (inquisition) at least ten times, sometimes on the rack. The facts concerning his death are conflicting. His accusers relate that Hut was planning a violent escape. By setting fire to the straw in his cell, he hoped to lure his guard, intending to strangle him, take the keys, and escape.[96] On the other hand, his son related that as Hut lay in his cell like a dead man from the treatment he had received, his candle accidentally ignited the straw and caused his death by asphyxiation.[97] At any rate, lacking respect even for the dead, the court pronounced sentence the following day on Hut's corpse, and his dead body was burned at the stake on December 7, 1527.

7. *The Sociology of Hut's Activities*

If Hut's religious convictions and activities before his baptism could be characterized by revolutionary chiliasm and aimless wandering, his life thereafter was one of determination and total commitment to the propagation of the Anabaptist faith in the context of the Anabaptist brotherhood. But what kind of person was he, what form did the movement he originated take sociologically, and who were the authorities that had so much to say about him?

Hut was a dynamic person with many and varied abilities. He is described by the Nürnberg Council as follows:

> The highest and chief leader of the Anabaptists is Johannes Hut, a well-educated, clever fellow, rather tall, a peasant with light brown cropped hair and a blond mustache. He dressed in a gray, sometimes black, ridingcoat, a broad gray hat, and gray pants. He is from

95 Fellmann, *Denck*, 17 f.
96 *Confessions*, 253.
97 Rudolph Wolkan, *Geschichts-Buch der Hutterischen Brüder* (Macleod, Alta., and Vienna, 1923), 47.

> Königsberg and a book salesman by trade. He is also a cabinetmaker and adept at other trades.[98]

Some of the other trades he plied, when necessary, were bookbinding, locksmithing, and the making of screws.

Hut's religious fervor and intensity can be seen in his remarkable ability to move men. On his missionary tours Hut appeared like an Old Testament prophet with a New Testament group of disciples around him. He would turn up suddenly in some out-of-the-way place and leave just as suddenly, thus evading the authorities. As long as he was not known he could perform his trade during the day and spread the faith during the evening. At times he conducted his meetings at night so that men would not have to leave their work during the day.[99] Once he was being hunted he had to move secretly, accepting sustenance from his friends and converts. His eloquence and knowledge of the Bible, together with a note of urgency, fascinated people and won them quickly to the Anabaptist cause. On a number of occasions Hut visited a place for the first time some evening and after a few hours of preaching and baptizing would move on leaving a small Anabaptist congregation. This ability gave rise to fantastic reports about his powers and influence,[100] for example, that he instiuted secrets that were carefully restricted to a select few who recognized each other by mysterious signs,[101] and that he had in his possession a book that was given to the Prophet Daniel[102] and a secret fluid that could be used to beguile men.[103]

In a typical meeting Hut would preach Christ crucified, showing that He was obedient to the Father in suffering and unto death. He would tell them that the Gospel must be preached to all creatures and whoever believed and was baptized would be saved. A man must be willing to follow Christ in suffering, affliction, distress and persecution. There was no time to lose in making this decision, for God would soon come to judge the world. After the sermon Hut baptized and welcomed into the brotherhood those who desired it. After the simple baptism, the Lord's Supper was celebrated, Hut explaining that Christ was not present in the bread and wine but that it was a memorial of His suffering.

As long as possible Hut preached openly and in the homes of friends, but as time went on he was driven to preach in out-of-the-way mills, in meadows, in brick kilns, in woods, gardens, and base-

98 *Bayern* II, 8, and Wappler, *op. cit.*, 245.
99 *Confessions*, 225.
100 *Confessions*, 221.
101 Nicoladoni, *op. cit.*, 173.
102 *Confessions*, 240.
103 See Leonhard Schiemer's tract, *Volget nun vom Flaeschlen, gantz claerlich endteckt, was es badeytet, allen Frommen Troestlich zu leesen*, in *Glaubenszeugnisse* I, 72-77.

ments. He found the best response among tradesmen,[104] but men in the professions—priests, sextons, students—were also attracted. In his confession he accounted for about 250 men whom he had baptized, but their number was probably much greater.[105]

Although Hut had all the marks of a charismatic leader he was not so carried away by the moving of the Spirit that he was oblivious to the form of the Church. He was careful to provide sufficient organization to maintain order, preserve the faith, and keep the brotherhood united while expanding. His preaching had a strong congregational note and an emphasis on brotherly love and sharing, covenant loyalty and discipline. Leaders, and at times also deacons, were chosen to head the local groups. He commissioned most of the wandering apostles himself.[106] Only those who were sent by the church should preach and baptize. Finally, to establish the brethren in the faith, to face the missionary challenge, and to keep the larger brotherhood unified, Hut planned larger meetings that he referred to as councils. The only one that materialized during his lifetime was the one at Augsburg in August 1527.

8. *Political Opposition*

The area of Hut's activity and influence was under Hapsburg domination during the 1520's. Ferdinand I was Archduke of Austria after 1521, and after 1526 King of Hungary and King of Bohemia. Charles V was Emperor of the Holy Roman Empire from 1519 to 1556, and though some Protestants looked to him with hope in the early twenties, he remained strongly with the old Roman Church. In Bavaria the reigning dukes were William IV and Louis, who also represented the old order and were responsible for the horrifying watchword, "All Anabaptists are to be punished with death. Whoever recants will be beheaded; whoever does not recant will be burned."[107] This command was carried out with great severity, for between 1527 and 1581, 223 Anabaptists were executed in Bavaria alone. According to one source, the Inn Valley in Tyrol saw the burning of no fewer than 1,000 Anabaptists between 1527 and 1530. At Linz in 1529, 70 brethren were put to death in one procedure.[108]

Because this area was under the control of the Roman Church no debates or disputations between the Anabaptists and their op-

104 The following is a list of some of the trades represented among his converts: needle makers, linen weavers, cabinetmakers, millers, butchers, coopers, smiths, stone masons, carpenters, hoe makers, tailors, bricklayers, grinders, and shoemakers. Cf. Neuser, *op. cit.*, 43 (MSS).

105 *Confessions*, 226 f.

106 A list of the men that Hut commissioned to serve as Anabaptist apostles would be impressive. See the list of those in attendance at the Martyr Synod in *ME* III (1957), 529-531.

107 *ME* I, 251.

108 See Paul Schowalter, "Martyrs," *ME* III (1957), 521-525; also John Horsch, "Persecution of the Evangelical Anabaptists," *MQR* XII (1938), 3-26.

ponents were held here. This is significant in a period of rapidly changing religious ideas. In Switzerland there were about forty disputations between the Anabaptists and the Reformed Church from 1523 to 1540. This gave the Anabaptists opportunity to demonstrate that they were not sectarian but were willing to converse about points of difference from state-church theologians and officials. The disputations provide a valuable and unique source for the place of the Anabaptists in the intellectual history of sixteenth-century Switzerland. Debates, recorded discussions, and disputations were also conducted in Strassbourg and at other points up the Rhine. Although this type of source material is missing for the southeast German area, the ruthless persecution by the authorities did drive the Anabaptists to write more tracts, confessions, and epistles than in other areas.

The government opposition to the Anabaptist movement in the South German area followed in the trail of Hut's labors.[109] The first mandate directed specifically against Anabaptists was that of Bishop Weigand of Bamberg in March 1, 1527. In the same month Nürnberg issued an edict against Hans Hut. On October 11, 1527, while Hut was in prison, Augsburg threatened membership in an Anabaptist group with corporal and capital punishment. On October 18 and 27, 1527, Matthias Lang, Cardinal of Salzburg, ordered raids to hunt out the Anabaptists; on April 18, 1528, he decreed the death penalty for Anabaptist preachers. On November 1, 1527, Regensburg announced severe corporal punishment for adult baptism and for sheltering Anabaptists. On November 5, 1527, Dukes William and Louis of Bavaria required all Anabaptists to be seized, and on January 26, 1529, Styria ordered the seizure of Anabaptists and the burning of their homes.

Ferdinand I of Austria was most active in attacking the Anabaptists.[110] On August 20, 1527, while the Martyr Synod was in session, Ferdinand issued a general mandate against all Protestants. On October 23, 1527, a special mandate against the Anabaptists was proclaimed for Upper Austria, which was reissued January 16, 1528. A similar mandate was issued on February 4, 1528, for Lower Austria. On February 27, 1528, Ferdinand stipulated that rebaptized persons be put to death in spite of recantation. On March 24, 1528, this was further sharpened by ordering death by fire for Anabaptist preachers and beheading for the penitent. On April 1, 1528, a note of leniency appeared in a mandate for Upper Austria; pardon was to

109 A list of the mandates directed against the Anabaptists appears in *ME* III (1957), 446-453.

110 Grete Mecenseffy and Robert Friedmann, "Ferdinand I," *ME* II (1956), 322 f.

be granted to Anabaptists if they voluntarily recanted, accepted church penance, and betrayed their preachers!

The mandate of Emperor Charles V passed at Speyer on January 4, 1528, less than a month after Hut's death, extended the persecution of Anabaptists to the whole empire. Henceforth no Anabaptist was safe any longer. The imperial decree was in short order supported by further mandates by princes, bishops, and cities. On February 22, 1528, the Swabian League decided to send out 400 horsemen as scouts to ferret out Anabaptists. When the Diet of Speyer on April 22, 1529, assented to the imperial mandate of the previous year, persecution of Anabaptists reached its ultimate severity.

Since the teachings of Hut were largely responsible for the flow of so much blood in South Germany, they must be looked at carefully.

II. Hut's Teachings

A. The Church

The centrality of the church in Hut's writings and life is striking. Hut must be asknowledged as one of the greatest evangelists and congregation founders of the whole left wing of the Reformation, making him in a sense the Apostle Paul of the South German Anabaptist movement. Although he had no direct relationship with the founding disciples of evangelical Anabaptism in Zürich[1] (1523-1525), he entered into their heritage and became one of the greatest propagators of the new faith. The primary sources for his view of the church and the Christian faith are his two major tracts.

After his baptism on May 26, 1526, in Augsburg, the church-brotherhood was the key to Hut's view of the Christian faith and the work of God in the world. In his confessions Hut referred continually to "his brotherhood,"[2] and his teachings concerning baptism, the covenant, the Lord's Supper, community of goods based on love, discipleship, and church leadership are all set in the context of the new brotherhood that God was raising up among men. He speaks of following Christ "and His chosen ones,"[3] and of preaching Christ crucified, "but not alone Christ the head, but rather the whole Christ with all His members."[4] When speaking of suffering he also referred to Christ suffering "in all His members."[5] Paul's figure of the mem-

1 See Harold S. Bender, *Conrad Grebel (ca. 1498-1526): The Founder of the Swiss Brethren* (Goshen, 1950)
2 *Bayern* I, 41-2.
3 *Glaubenszeugnisse* I, 14.
4 *Ibid.*, 16.
5 *Ibid.*, 14. This passage sounds very similar to one in the writings of Hans Denck: "No one can come to know Christ in truth unless he follows Him with his life" (Fellmann, *Denck*, 45).

bers and the head, the Body of Christ, is very common in Hut's writings and plays an important part in his view of the nature of the church.

1. *Suffering Discipleship*

Hut believed that it is impossible to know Christ and be a member of His Body without being willing to suffer with Christ. The path from the realm of the world into the realm of the church can never by-pass the experience of suffering, affliction, and persecution. "For no one is able to arrive at the truth unless he follows in the steps of Christ and His chosen ones in the school of affliction (*Trübsal*)."[6] Men must give themselves in obedience to Christ and suffer the will of God in body and soul in order to attain salvation.[7] Whoever did not walk in His footsteps and in His way and did not want to bear the cros sof Christ, would never know or possess Christ.[8] In order to receive the righteousness that Christ provided for His own by the cross men must be willing to bear the cross. With other Anabaptists, Hut criticized the easy faith and easy justification that the Reformers preached.[9] Without accepting the claims of perfectionism Hut believed that righteousness was desired by Christ and was possible for voluntary, disciplined members in the Body of Christ.

Besides the figures of following in the steps of Christ and bearing His cross, Hut also used the parable of the Word becoming flesh in Christians even as Christ was born in Mary.[10] When this becomes true the life, suffering, persecution, death, and resurrection are all relived in the Christian. "This will not come to pass except through pain, poverty, and misery within and without ."[11] The imitation of Christ and suffering are accompanied by the virtue of resingation (*Gelassenheit*). If the preaching of the scribes and priests does not lead to reformation of their lives, it is because "They lacked the discernment which one receives through suffering and poverty, which leads to separation from the world and resignation, and on the other hand to incorporation in the Body of Christ where all understanding is revealed."[12] It appears as if everyone wants to know Christ but no one wants to suffer with Him. If the Spirit of God were known through sensual pleasure and the pomp of this world the world would be full of Christians.[13] Christ disguised and hid Himself from

6 *Ibid.*, 19.
7 *Ibid.*
8 *Ibid.*, 34.
9 *Ibid.*, 13, 37.
10 *Ibid.*, 34.
11 *Ibid.*
12 *Ibid.*, 32.
13 *Ibid.*, 26.

man by coming in the flesh. It is in suffering the highest resignation that He has revealed and is revealing Himself to His brothers. Here the grace of God is first discovered; here the highest degree of divine righteousness and the beginning of divine mercy is found. Here man becomes conformed to Christ and completely united with his brothers into one Body.[14]

2. *Community of Goods*

Hut does not have much to say about community of goods but he does say a number of times that those who are one Body and community in Christ practice sharing. In the Body of Christ, the Kingdom of God, all goodness, mercy, honor, and praise are present in the Holy Spirit, "there all things are common, nothing private."[15] The covenant means submission in obedience to Christ and expresses itself in "godly love to all brothers and sisters with body, life, property ,and honor, regardless of the evil gossip and misunderstanding of the world."[16] This total commitment of every area of the believer's life to the brothers within the brotherhood was very clearly and forcefully delineated in Hut and his converts. It has some similarity to the love-communism of the early Church as Troeltsch has described it. For Hut, property was one of the areas of the total life that had to submit to the purposes and responsibilities of the Kingdom of God. Hut compared the ambitions and temptations in a Christian's life to the branches of a tree that must be cut off before the trunk can be worked into a log for building purposes, including among these branches the desire for property, fields, and pastures.[17] No man has a right to a particular vocation or to property; a Christian must be willing to forsake all for the Kingdom of Christ.[18]

When Hut was questioned about his teaching on property he said that he never taught or forced anyone to sell his property. Surplus, however, should be directed to helping the needy and should the wealthy sell land, vineyards, and other things in order to share with their poorer brethren, there is nothing wrong with it.[19] Certainly he never encouraged anyone to sell his property so as to be able to move to a location from which an overthrow of the government could be staged.[20] There is no basis in Hut's teachings and activities to justify the charge that Hut required the wealthy to give their property and riches to strangers.[21] It is quite possible, however, that his

14 *Ibid.*
15 *Ibid.*, 36.
16 *Ibid.*, 20.
17 *Ibid.*, 18.
18 *Ibid.*, 22.
19 *Bayern* I, 44.
20 *Confessions*, 232; *Bayern* I, 44.
21 *Confessions*, 244.

emphasis on the subordination of property and possessions to the church-brotherhood had some bearing on the beginnings of the Hutterite movement.[22] He certainly was responsible for providing the background for the easy transition from South German and Austrian Anabaptism to the Moravian communal settlements. In South Germany, however, sharing was never formally organized although it remained a vital part of the covenant commitment.

3. "The Mystery of Baptism"

When Hut was asked what the central teaching and article of the Anabaptist covenant and brotherhood was he answered,[23] "The Gospel of Christ the crucified who suffered for us and was obedient to the Father unto death. This means that we must be willing to follow Christ and suffer for His sake whatever is placed upon us, even unto death."[24] In the light of Hut's concept of the church and its challenge to men, this means three things: the preaching of the Gospel, faith, and baptism.[25] Baptism will be looked at first, and the other two in relationship to it.

Hut's view of baptism must be seen in the light of his own experience. Before his baptism his message and influence had been primarily revolutionary and individualistic but afterwards his concern was the expansion of the corporate Body of Christ. For him to identify himself with the Anabaptist movement, in the realization that his previous insights were faulty, meant a deep struggle. He had received some stimulus and direction from Luther's teachings and some inspiration from his contacts with Müntzer. Previous to his baptism he had also paid the bitter loss of house and home for his convictions. To admit that all this was not the culmination of what God was doing in the world and to realize that there was a church-brotherhood to which he could relate his life was a great step in his life. His age, approximately 38 years, did not make it any easier.[26]

In justifying his baptism to the authorities he gave the following reasons for having accepted it: Caspar Ferber's description of the Christian life of some brothers in the Inn Valley who have received baptism;[27] the absence of reformation in the lives of the followers of Luther;[28] and the Scriptural order, i.e., first preaching, then faith, and then baptism. According to the last chapter of Matthew, one is to teach first and then baptize. Nowhere in the Holy Scriptures did

22 Wolfgang Brandhuber's letter in *Glaubenszeugnisse* I, 137-43, was a popular document among the early Hutterites.
23 *Bayern* I, 46.
24 *Ibid.*, 42.
25 *Ibid.*
26 Wappler, *op. cit.*, 232.
27 *Confessions*, 224.
28 *Ibid.*

Christ command that infants be baptized nor did He or the apostles ever baptize any infants.[29]

Hut dedicated his longest single tract to the interpretation of baptism, *About the Mystery of Baptism, both the Sign and the Essence: the Beginning of a Right and True Christian Life.*[30] Hut began his writing by lamenting the distortion of the Gospel by the new evangelicals, who after having driven the Pope, monks and priests from authority were doing no better themselves.[31] Out of the false faith which they preached no reformation of life followed. In order to change this he suggested that the biblical order-preaching, faith, and then baptism-be observed. Wherever this order was not maintained there could be no true Christian congregation.

The preaching of the Gospel is to be done using created things, i.e., "through the whole creation."[32] He explained this by saying that God had given us created things that the visible might be used to understand the invisible. Christ, for example, explained the nature of life and eternity to the woman at the well by means of the material water she had given him to drink. Similarly any occupation or trade can become a book through which one learns to know the will of God. All of history can even be looked upon as "creature" through which we can learn what God has to say. This is not thought of as a substitute for the written Word of God, but merely a means for explaining the Gospel message to seeking people. A common use of this figure in Anabaptist writings of South Germany is the example of the suffering that animals must go through in order to be of any use to man; in the same way Christ had to suffer before His redemption became effective, and even so, man must suffer as he follows Christ and does the will of God.[33] Once the Gospel had been preached and understood rightly it issued in obedience and suffering. This is faith. To these two baptism must be added.

Baptism must be understood in relationship to the concept of covenant. Hut interpreted baptism as a covenant made before a Christian congregation that had itself received the covenant from God and in the name of God had the power to extend it to those who desired it.[34] What the fellowship-brotherhood would bind on earth would be bound in heaven. Only those who had heard the Gospel, accepted it, and believed it could be added to the fellowship-

29 *Bayern* I, 42; *Confessions*, 223 f.
30 "Von dem geheimnus der tauf, baide des zaichens und des wessens, ein anfang eines rechten warhaftigen christlichen lebens" (*Glaubenszeugnisse* I, 12-28).
31 *Ibid.*, 14.
32 *Ibid.*, 15.
33 *Bayern* I, 35 (Ambrosius Spittelmayer); *Glaubenszeugnisse* I, 49 (Leonhard Schiemer); *Ibid.*, 85 (Hans Schlaffer).
34 *Glaubenszeugnisse* I, 20.

community. This covenant was considered a commitment of obedience to Christ that manifested itself in love to all brothers and sisters with body, life, property, and honor, regardless of the critcisms of the world.[35] An individual making this commitment was assured through bapitsm that he was an accepted child of God, a brother or sister of Christ, a member of the Christian community and of the Body of Christ.[36] Baptism, following proclamation and faith, was not itself the true means by which men become religious, but was merely a sign, a covenant, and reminder of the commitment which would daily involve him in true baptism, which Christ called the water of all affliction (*Wasser aller Trübsal*). This figure referred to the process by which Christ washed, purified, and justified men from their lusts, sins, and evil deeds. If God is to justify a man he must remain quiet and allow God to accomplish His work in him. "In this manner the water of all affliction is the true essence and power of baptism and the means by which man sinks into the death of Christ."[37] This baptism was not introduced for the first time in the days of Christ but all the chosen friends of God from Adam on have experienced this baptism. Christ received this covenant from God in the Jordan when He testified of His obedience to the Father and His love for all men, even unto death.[38]

The sign of the covenant of baptism is given and offered by the Christian community through a faithful servant, even as Christ received it from John; but the essence of baptism is a gift of God that He grants through the water of all affliction and through comfort in the Holy Spirit. Whoever desires to be a disciple of Christ must be baptized in this way and be cleansed in Spirit through the covenant of peace into one Body.[39]

The latter part of Hut's tract on baptism is devoted to interpreting baptism as a covenant of rebirth (*Wiedergeburt*) and renewal in the Holy Spirit.[40] This is the only basis for an irreproachable community under God. Baptism as rebirth or regeneration is to be understood as a crucifixion and annihilation of the lust and disobedience that arises in an individual against God. The way to eternal life is narrow if it leads to newness of life in God through the death of the old self. Seen in this light true baptism is nothing other than a struggle with sin through the whole of life.[41]

35 *Ibid.*
36 *Ibid.*
37 *Ibid.*, 21.
38 *Ibid.*
39 *Ibid.*
40 *Ibid.*, 24-28. This is as comprehensive a treatment of the new birth (Wldergeburt) as appears in any early South German Anabaptist tract.
41 *Ibid.*, 25.

In his confessions Hut summarized and related baptism, the covenant, and the church as follows:

> Baptism consists of three things, Spirit, water and blood. They are in essence one and give testimony on earth. The Spirit refers to trust in the Word of God and commitment to live according to it. The Word calls this the covenant of God that He makes by His Spirit in the hearts of men. Beyond this God gave water as a sign of the covenant that a man might reveal himself openly and testify of his desire to lead an irreproachable life in true obedience to God and all Christians. Whoever transgresses and sins against God and brotherly love should be disciplined orally by the others. This is the ban[42] that God refers to as the witness before the Church. Blood is the baptism that Christ mentioned to His disciples when He asked them, 'do you desire to receive the baptism with which I have been baptized?' This is the baptism that gives testimony throughout the world when the blood of one who has received it, is spilled.[43]

Hut had a high view of baptism and he gave it an important place in his system. The following is a summary of its role: (1) Baptism is related to the beginning of a life of suffering discipleship. (2) Baptism is connected with rebirth, regeneration, and the beginning of a renewal of one's life under the chastening hand of God. (3) Baptism is a part of one's injunction and incorporation into the Body of Christ as a living, functioning member. (4) Baptism is a public sign administered by the binding and loosing brotherhood to indicate the real baptism that takes place when one participates in the death of Christ through the water of all affliction. (5) Baptism is an expression of the covenant commitment of one's whole life to God and the brotherhood. (6) Baptism is the beginning of a life of love, admonition, and discipline among covenant brothers. (7) Baptism is the beginning of a common struggle against sin and evil that lasts through all of life.

4. *The Lord's Supper*

Hut's extant writings do not say much about the Lord's Supper. Nothing appears in his two major tracts, and in his confessions he merely answers the questions about transubstantiation.[44] He interpreted communion as a partaking in the bread and wine, not in the body and blood of Christ. Christ himself referred to the cup as the fruit of the vine. It was after Christ had offered the twelve bread and wine that He spoke of it as the new covenant in His blood, and it was after they had partaken that He laid down His life and gave His blood for them. All this convinces Hut that Christ gave His disciples bread and wine in remembrance of His sufferings and not His

42 This is the only reference to the ban in the writings of Hans Hut.
43 *Bayern* I, 43; *Confessions*, 227.
44 *Ibid.*, 43-44; *Confessions*, 228.

flesh and blood. On several occasions during his work in Franconia Hut observed the Lord's Supper.[45] It is possible that he was influenced in his view of the Supper as a memorial meal by Zwingli through some Swiss Anabaptists.[46]

5. Church Order

When Hut was asked in the course of a trial who the leading brethren in his brotherhood were he said that there were so many leaders and teachers that he would not be able to indicate them all. As examples he mentioned Jacob Dachser, Sigmund Salminger, Jakob Gross, Eukarius von Coburg, Joachim, and Leonhard.[47] He was quite sure that none of these were special disciples and apostles. If somebody was to be sent on a special commission, they chose one from among the brethren. Although there was no doubt about the fact that Hut played a special role in the life of the Anabaptist movement of South Germany in 1527, he was quite right in saying that every group had its own leaders and when he visited them he merely proclaimed his message as one of them.

Hut consistently denied the oft repeated accusation that the Anabaptists in South Germany had special signs whereby they recognized one another.[48] When they met they merely called each other brethren and recognized each other by their Christian conversation and by their willingness to give an account of their faith. Even though the severity of the persecution from 1527 to 1530 made only a minimum of normal congregational life possible, this did not mean that the local groups did not function together and think of themselves as members of the church. The Martyr Synod was a glowing witness to the fact that they not only functioned as a church but, driven by their missionary zeal and by persecution, they operated as a small missionary band. Any brother that was commissioned to go out as an apostle was merely instructed to comfort and teach the brethren wherever they would find them.[49] The letter which Hans Hut gave the Anabaptist apostles who were commissioned by the Martyr Synod is an honor to his ecumenicity and peace-loving spirit.[50] In the letter he confesses that he has allowed the brotherhood to influence his teaching, and he appeals to all the brothers to manifest the same spirit for the sake of the unity of the church. There is a contagious awareness in the letter of the breaking in of the Kingdom

45 See above, I, section C.
46 Jacob Gross would be an example. See Christian Neff, "Jakob Gross," *ME* II (1956), 598 f.
47 *Bayern* I, 41 f.
48 *Confessions*, 225.
49 *Ibid.*, 226.
50 *Glaubenszeugnisse* I, 12. See Appendix I for an English translation.

of God with power. Nothing was to hinder the spread of the Body of Christ in the crucial days in which he was living.

6. *"A Christian Instruction"*

Hans Hut's view and understanding of the Scriptures throws light on his concept of church and world. In his tract, *"A Christian Instruction on how the Holy Scriptures are to be Compared and Judged,"*[51] he showed that the church stands opposed to the world and is the culmination of God's redemptive work in history. The church is the reason for which Christ gave His life and the realm in which the Holy Spirit is working redemptively.

Hut's tract raised one main question: Why do so many people misunderstand the Scriptures? He attacked the problem by analyzing three means by which men come to know God: (1) through His almighty power evident in created things; (2) through the severity and righteousness of the Son; and (3) through the grace and mercy of the Holy Spirit.[52] These three are interrelated and all three necessary for a true understanding of God. There are three parallel areas of which the Scriptures speak: (1) Scripture tells us of created things and that man, tempted, confused, and blinded by them, turns from God; (2) Scripture speaks of suffering, affliction, and persecution, and how these lead man to turn from his lust and love for created things back to God; and (3) Scripture speaks of the perfection that is open to those who love by the command of God through the Holy Spirit in the church.[53] In his tract he related these three areas to the three parts of the Apostolic Creed: We believe in God the Father, creator of heaven and earth; and in Jesus Christ His only Son, our Lord, conceived of the Holy Spirit; and in the Holy Spirit, one holy community of saints, and the forgiveness of sins.

Hut related these three categories of ideas by postulating that man (1) will only be released from bondage to the lust of this world and the love for created things, (2) through the cross of Christ, suffering and sorrow, and (3) thereby become a member of the Body of Christ through the Holy Spirit.[54] The second area, suffering discipleship, is the crucial one, for it is the only means whereby a man may pass from the "world" into the church. The great error of the false preachers was that they preached to the people about the church without ever telling them about the means of attaining membership in the Body of Christ. This makes an insolent, lazy people in whom

51 "Ein christlicher underricht, wie göttliche geschrift vergleicht und geurtailt solle werden" (*Glaubenszeugnisse* I, 28-37).
52 *Ibid.*, 28.
53 *Ibid.*, 29.
54 *Ibid.*, 36.

no improvement in life is evident.[55] It is in the light of this threefold outline that Hut's influence on the South German Anabaptist movement will be analyzed, but before this is done it will be necessary to look at his eschatology, his attitude to the State, and the influence of Thomas Müntzer and Hans Denck upon him.

B. The State

1. *Eschatology*

In discussing eschatology[56] it is easy to think of the aberrations it has produced rather than of its significant role in the life of the early church. On the one hand there is the example of the Münsterite episode with violence and bloodshed, a truly abortive attempt to bring in the Kingdom of God by force and violence; but on the other hand there is the testimony of the early church, which was keenly aware of Christ's words about the signs of His coming and the close of the age. Paul spoke of Christ turning over the Kingdom to God, who will destroy every rule and every authority and power until He reigns over all His enemies.[57] A pertinent, frequently cited section of Scripture was Matthew 24.[58] Hut referred to these passages when he spoke of his hope in the return of Christ and he found in them many parallels to his own day and his own experience, such as the severe suffering of Christians, false prophets in the Evangelical and Roman Churches, and urgent rumors of the threatening Turkish armies. Hut's disappointment in the Wittenberg Reformers and the shattering of his confidence in Müntzer fanned the flame of his hope that God would soon return to judge the earth.

What did Hut actually say about eschatology? In his confession of November 26, 1527, he admitted that there had been a time when he believed that according to Revelation 13 and Daniel 12, God had given the world three and one-half years to repent. In the meantime those who believed in God would be persecuted and would suffer

55 *Ibid.*, 37.

56 Littell, *op. cit.*, 70 f., 88 f., 106 f. This is probably the best treatment of the role of eschatology among early Anabaptists. See also Frank Wray, *op. cit.*, 224-252.

57 I Cor. 15:24-27 (RSV).

58 In order to provide a background for Hut's eschatology a paraphrase of a section of Matthew 24 follows. Christ said there will be wars and rumor of wars, kingdom will rise up against kingdom, and there will be famines and earthquakes. Men will be hated for Christ's sake and will be delivered up to tribulation and put to death. False prophets will arise, and there will be greater tirbulation than there has been from the beginning of the world. Men will flee to the mountains and a man in the field will not turn back to take his mantle. Two men will be in a field, one will be taken and the other left. For those eating and drinking with the drunken the Master will come on a day when they do not expect Him and He will punish them and they will weep and gnash their teeth. When the tribulation is at its height the tribes of the earth will mourn and they will see the Son of Man coming on the clouds of heaven with power and great glory. He will gather all the nations before Him and will separate them one from another as a shepherd separates the sheep from the goats. He will send out His angels with a loud trumpet call and they will gather His elect from the four winds. Of that day and hour no one knows, therefore men must be ready, for the Son of Man is coming in an hour they do not expect.

and there would be famine, disease and war. Then God would return to gather His own and they would punish the authorities and all sin.[59] The attitude of the court toward Hut's eschatology is clearly shown by the fact that the list of charges against him included predictions that the oppressed would rule and destroy all cities, the Kingdom of Christ would be established on earth, the righteous would take revenge on the ungodly, and the ungodly would be forced to turn over their property to strangers.[60]

Although Hut denied each one of these charges, his word was never accepted, and after his death more details were added to this charge. By 1529 and 1530 Hut's teaching was pictured thus: three and one-half years after the Peasants' Revolt God would give the Anabaptists the sword to punish sin, annihilate the authorities, murder all those not rebaptized, and institute community of property and wives. Before this took place there would be wars, famine, disease and judgment; and the Turks would invade the land annihilating all those not doing the will of God. But with the coming of the Turks the Gospel would be proclaimed freely and those covenanted would flee to Hungary, Mühlhausen, and Switzerland. Those who had accepted the covenant would annihilate those left by the Turks and after this Christ would return and the Day of the Lord would begin and Christ's Kingdom would be established on earth.[61]

This is in summary what Hans Weischenfelder,[62] in March 1527, accused Hut of teaching and what the authorities in 1529 and 1530 asked those who were recanting to acknowledge. Marx Maier[63] and Jörg von Passau[64] both recanted their previous Anabaptist positions and both admitted that Hut was guilty of the accusations the authorities had drawn up. But there is another aspect to Hut's eschatology that is easily overlooked. Even though Hut was more interested in Matthew 24, I Corinthians 15, and the books of Daniel and Revelation than any other early Anabaptist, there are other differences in his position more subtle and more obvious than the above accusations might indicate.

To begin with, the Turks are not mentioned anywhere in Hut's writings or confessions. If he did refer to them, which is quite likely, it was probably in a manner similar to others who were convinced that it would be a sorry day for Europe if they should gain control. This would not be the first time that the church recognized a foreign foe as the scourge of God.

59 *Confessions*, 239.
60 *Ibid.*, 243 f.
61 Wappler, *op. cit.*, 242, 244, 247 f., 280 f.; *Bayern* I, 188; *Bayern* II, 178 f.
62 *Ibid.*, 242-248.
63 *Bayern* II, 178 f. 64 *Bayern* I, 188.

Hut did not relate the three and one-half years that God was giving the world to repent to any specific time, but on the contrary in his confessions he vehemently denied that anyone could know the day of Christ's return.

> He believes that Christ will soon come to judge the world and all things in their present disorder, according to the clear indications of Holy Scripture. But what time and what hour it will be is hidden from all men. No one can know this but God alone.[65]

While Hans Weischenfelder was testifying concerning Hut's revolutionary eschatology his brother Mertein gave exactly the opposite testmiony. He said that Hut never spoke about the Turks or about an overthrow of the authorities; in fact, Hut said that if there were war one should not participate in it, if a lord asked for a penny he should be given two, and if he struck a man he should turn the other cheek. If the war cry were sounded and an individual was requested to go, he should rather flee to the woods or hide in a cave.[66] This testimony has more in common with the writings and confessions of Hut than do Veit Weischenfelder's and Marx Maier's testimonies. It is quite probably that men found in Hut what they were looking for and that someone with revolutionary tendencies would find some support in Hut's ideas.

Among Hubmaier's charges listed by Hut were the accusations that Hut claimed the Judgment Day could be fixed, that the Anabaptists would judge the world, and that power would be taken from the authorities and be given to the Anabaptists.[67] Hut denied all these accusations and said that he knew no more about the judgment and the Day of the Lord than was revealed in the Scriptures. He had merely gathered comfort from the Scripture so that those being persecuted might know of the reward that was awaiting them.[68]

Furthermore, Hut maintained that God would do the judging on the Last Day, not man.[69] Some hearing him preach, who were still under the influence of Müntzer and the Peasant's Revolt, would naturally miss this distinction. There is an important difference between claiming that God, not men, would judge the world, and that God, not the church, would take the power from the authorities. In his confession of October 5, 1527, Hut said: "I know of no other future of Christ than as the holy Scriptures indicate; there will not be a temporal Kingdom but a spiritual one."[70] Ambrosius Spittel-

65 *Ibid.*, 44.
66 Wappler, *op. cit.*, 240, 243.
67 *Confessions*, 232.
68 *Ibid.*, 232-234.
69 *Ibid.*, 242.
70 *Ibid.*, 231.

mayr, Hans Nadler, Leonhard Schiemer, and Hans Schlaffer all testify that Hut took this nonrevolutionary and biblical position.[71]

In the light of this testimony, what was it that Hut promised not to preach, according to the open letter that he wrote while at the Martyr Synod? Although there is no extant account of Hut's telling any of his converts in Austria about the three and one-half years, it is possible that if he held this position that he agreed at the Martyr Synod to keep quiet about it. This was the point in Hut's alleged teaching that would have been most objectionable to Hans Denck and the other Anabaptist leaders gathered at the Martyr Synod. But the letter indicates that he went beyond this and promised to be quiet about the entire subject of eschatology. This subjects Marx Maier's report of three years later to suspicion for it is very unlikely that the sixty Anabaptists attending the Synod would have agreed on a fixed termination of the world as Maier suggested.[72]

2. *Obedience to the Government*

Since there was no basis in Hut's eschatology for the charge of a revolutionary attitude toward the authorities what further light do his confessions throw on his view and relationship to the authorities? Of the accusations directed against Hut three were concerned with a revolutionary attitude to government. They accused him of being one of Müntzer's disciples with the same revolutionary intentions, of inciting men to annihilate the authorities, and of agreeing with the pastor of Eltersdorf that the authorities are not Christian.[73]

Hut admitted in his confessions that he had once been under the influence of Müntzer, "but since then he had changed his mind, and had been told and taught other things."[74] On two other occasions in his confessions he denied ever having been an adherent of the Müntzer sect.[75] He said repeatedly "that he knows of no revolt directed against the authorities, either in action or otherwise. He has not encouraged revolt himself, nor has he helped anyone else."[76] He said that he believed firmly with Paul and Christ that one must be obedient to the authorities.[77] Barring the possible misunderstanding of his eschatology there is no basis in the sources for believing that he advocated anything but obedience to the authorities after the spring of 1527.

Hut had very little to say about the nature of government, its

71 See below, Chapter V, section B.
72 *Bayern* I, 199. Fellmann has accepted Maier's statement as true (Fellmann, *Denck*, 17 f.).
73 *Confessions*, 243 f.
74 *Ibid.*, 251.
75 *Ibid.*, 243; *Bayern* I, 44.
76 *Bayern* I, 43.
77 *Confessions*, 227.

origin, its duties, and the limits to its authority. The few statements he made show that he believed the origin and destiny of governments abide in God. In his preaching he was more concerned about their destiny than he was about any theorizing regarding their origin. He agreed with the Reformers and peaceful Anabaptists in confessing "that all power comes from God."[78] His leading disciples and followers, who in other respects reflect his thought most closely, stated clearly that all governments have been instituted by God,[79] but that the exercising of government responsibilities was as sinful as man had become; the civil authorities did not always carry out their duty of protecting the good and punishing the evil. This conviction was substantiated by his own experiences with the civil authorities. When, as a result of scruples of conscience, he refused to have his child baptized, the civil authorities tried to coerce him with the threat of imprisonment and banishment. At Nikolsburg he was imprisoned because of his nonresistant position and had to flee to avoid the harsh hand of the authorities. In Augsburg he was imprisoned and severely tortured by the authorities because of his religious principles. This would have been enough to convince him that the authorities were not on the side of God, at least in this one area of the exercise of their authority.

That he recognized the limitations of governmental authority is shown in his refusal to swear an oath to the government if the occasion conflicted with the will of God.[80] This was in keeping with his conviction that the sword should not be drawn from its sheath except at the command of God.[81] In other words, the Christian must be obedient to the authorities, but the authorities do not have an absolute right over his conscience.

3. *Participation in Warfare*

There is one passage in Hut's confession of September 16, 1527, that presents a serious problem, since it does not clearly show whether or not Hut took the basically nonresistant position of the other Swiss and South German Anabaptists. A translation of the recorder's report follows:

> He does not agree with the articles even though the furrier and others spoke about them and he has been disciplined on account of it. He showed them Scriptures to prove that swearing an oath for the authorities is not against God. If anything were contrary to God he would not swear it. Mangmeister also asked him about swearing to the authorities, and he showed him that it was not against God.

78 *Bayern* I, 43.
79 *Ibid.*, 52. See also below, Chapter V, section B.
80 *Confessions*, 227.
81 See note 38.

> Concerning the oath he taught the brethren that the demand of the authorities to swear oaths in common state and civil matters is not forbidden. Men must obey the government, for some maintain the Christians should not engage in combat nor participate in warfare, but he showed them Scriptures ot prove that they are obliged to do so (if they want to be subject to the authorities) even as Christ subjected Himself to the authorities. Whoever does not want to do this may sell what he has and move away. Some also maintained that Christians should not carry arms, as in Switzerland, for example, where they have made a regulation to this effect. He also denied this and showed them that it is not forbidden and is not against God. In a similar manner, concerning dress some had indicated that clothing must be simple, but he showed them that it is also not forbidden by God, for every man should be allowed to dress as he pleases.[82]

There are four distinct matters involved here: the swearing of oaths, participation in warfare, the bearing and possession of arms, and conformity in dress. Concerning the oath, Hut did not interpret the Sermon on the Mount literally, but regarded it as an appeal to honesty. If in common state and civil matters the truth was clear and evident, one could verify the truth by means of an oath. This was not substantially different from the position of Denck[83] and Jörg Probst Rothenfelder.[84] The Swiss at times took a more literal position. Concerning the bearing of arms, Hut, putting a literal interpretation on Christ's statement that the disciples should sell their coats and buy swords,[85] thought there could therefore be nothing wrong with carrying and possessing a sword. The section concerning dress is probably an objection to a regulation made in St. Gall by marginal Anabaptists.[86] This statement is clear in all respects except in the matter of participation in warfare. Hut seems to say that in order to be obedient to the authorities it is necessary for a Christian to participate in warfare. This kind of statement appeared nowhere else in his writings or confessions. Since this put him in a good light with the authorities there is very little likelihood that they falsified his answer. Hut's natural interest in being released would make him try to state his confession in as plausible terms as possible to quell the charge of sedition. Hut's statement must be seen in the context of an ardent plea on his part to prove that he always had advocated obedience to the authorities.

Hut can hardly have based his advocacy of participation in warfare on the concept of absolute obedience to the authorities, for he openly challenged such authority in the matter of swearing oaths and the baptism of his child. His statement that the man who cannot

82 *Confessions*, 227 f.
83 Fellmann, *Denck*, 38 f., 110.
84 *Kunstbuch*, 194.
85 *Confessions*, 241 f.
86 Egli and Schoch, *Kesslers Sabbata*, 164 f.

obey has the alternative of selling what he has and moving away, but citing Christ as an example of one who did subject Himself willingly to the authorities, is not clear. It is not likely that Hut was trying to imply that Christ would have participated in warfare, for he presents Christ as the suffering nonresistant Messiah. The weight of his argument seems to rest on the conviction that there is no simple or easy justification for any kind of disobedience to the authorities. That times might come when God calls for a different way he never denied. He was probably saying that, though the Scriptures do not teach disobedience on any point, they do not exclude the possibility of disobedience. This was at any rate Hut's practice.

There are some passages in the sources that seem to oppose his apparent support of participation in warfare. In his sermon at Königsberg in the fall of 1526, Hut said that it was permissible to possess a sword but it should not be drawn from its sheath until God so commands.[87] In his confession of March 1527, after revealing a good understanding of Hut's basic position on preaching through created things, faith, baptism, and suffering, Mertein Weischenfelder said that Hut taught that one should love God above all things and one's neighbor as one's self.[88] In another confession he said that Hut taught one should help no one if the Turks should invade the country, but trust alone in God.[89]

> Thirdly, concerning a revolution against the government, he said with emphasis, that he never heard the baptist (Hut) speak about a revolution against the government. In contrast he (Hut) said to him, "If there is warring, do not go along, and if your lord demands a penny give him two, and if he strikes you on the cheek turn the other also. And if the cry of warfare approaches and men desire that you participate, you should rather flee to the woods and hide in a cave."[90]

Mertein Weischenfelder seemed convinced that Hut taught nonparticipation in warfare.

From the same area but testifying two years later is Hans Nadler.[91] In his long confession he demonstrated his dependence on Hut concerning baptism, the covenant, creation, the role of suffering, discipleship, and church discipline. He confessed with Hut that the final day was near but that the date was unkown. He said that he knew nothing about a new Kingdom except that it was in the future and that the living and the dead would be judged at that time. About

87 *Confessions*, 242.
88 Wappler, *op. cit.*, 237.
89 *Ibid.*, 240.
90 *Ibid.*, 242.
91 *Bayern* I, 131-141.

the authorities Nadler said that they were necessary because of evil-doers and are all ordained of God whether they are good or bad.

> One should not resist the authorities, for no Christian ought to engage in combat and fighting. Numerous brethren among us desire that we lay down our swords and arms. I have done this but it is no law; one may carry them or leave them according to the strength or weakness of one's faith."[92]

Nadler taught that a Christian should demonstrate love and faithfulness to all men, offending none and doing good wherever possible. This would bring with it suffering and persecution for the sake of Christ.

Although the record of the proceedings at Nikolsburg is not at all clear, it does seem that Hut opposed Hubmaier in the matter of participation in warfare and the payment of the wartax. As will become evident in the last chapter, all Hut's disciples during his activities from Nikolsburg to his imprisonment in Augsburg, were of the peaceful, nonresistant type.

This still does not solve the question of Hut's nonresistance. Two conclusions must be drawn. (1) There is contradictory evidence on this matter that will not be solved unless or until new evidence comes into the picture. (2) Hut's influence on his friends and on the South German Anabaptist movement was basically nonrevolutionary and in favor of nonparticipation in warfare.

If the contribution of Hans Hut's life lies in the fact that he baptized more converts, founded more new congregations, and commissioned more Anabaptist apostles than any other early leader in South Germany, then the contribution of his teaching lies in his clear delineation of the crucial role of suffering discipleship, and the corporate nature and missionary character of the church-brotherhood. Like other great leaders and reformers Hut is not remembered because he made no errors and built up a consistent system of teaching, but despite these things. There are many contradictions in his writings and he was obviously preoccupied with the eschatological element in Scripture, but he was spared from becoming the victim of these weaknesses because of his high view of the church and its unity. In his letter to the churches he stated his willingness to refrain from teaching his eschatological insights for the sake of the spread of the Church. It is because of this that his influence on the South German Anabaptist movement was primarily wholesome.

92 *Ibid.*, 136.

THE DOCTRINE OF ORIGINAL SIN AS HELD BY THE ANABAPTISTS OF THE SIXTEENTH CENTURY

ROBERT FRIEDMANN*

In the New Testament the term "original sin" does not appear, although the basic idea of the doctrine is found in Paul's epistles, Rom. 5 and I Cor. 15. But it should be noted that Paul nowhere overemphasized this idea; he asserts that men, if reborn in Christ, "will die to sin." It was not until the days of Augustine (d. 430) that the idea became a central issue of Christian anthropology and soteriology. Augustine taught that man became completely corrupt by the fall of Adam; that is he can do no good whatever (denying any freedom of the will), hence has to rely wholly upon God's forgiving grace, which the believer received undeservedly through the atoning death of Christ. Augustine defended this thesis against Pelagius (a British monk), who denied the sinfulness of man and thus asserted that man can do good of his own volition.

The Reformation, both Lutheran and Calvinistic, renewed definitely the Augustinian position of total corruption (or depravity) and of man's inability to do any good, mainly in opposition to both the Catholic doctrine of "Semi-Pelagianism" and the teachings of the humanists, above all Erasmus, who taught that man has a completely free will to decide for or against the good.

The Anabaptists were for the most part outside of all these controversies. With few exceptions they read neither Augustine nor Luther nor Erasmus; therefore the issue of original sin was for them of significance only as they found themselves in religious debates or polemics where they had to defend their position against their Catholic and Protestant opponents. In the rather extensive doctrinal literature of the Anabaptists of the 16th century there are scarcely more than a dozen pages dealing with the issue of original sin; in fact, most doctrinal tracts of the Anabaptist brethren completely by-pass this idea or doctrine. John C. Wenger in his *Doctrines of the Mennonites* (1952)[1] presents only one quotation from Menno Simons in his chapter on "Sin"; and Christian Neff[2] says that the Anabaptists avoided the term "original sin" because it is not found in the Scriptures.[3] Hans Denck declined outright to speak about original sin

* Dr. Robert Friedmann is Professor of History and Philosophy at Western Michigan University.

1 John C. Wenger, *The Doctrines of the Mennonites* (Scottdale, 1952) 10 f.

2 Christian Neff, article "Erbsünde" in *Mennonitisches Lexikon*, I (1913) 603-605.

3 Ulrich Stadler, a Hutterite brother, says expressly in a letter of 1536: "Das wort erbsünd hat in der ganzen heiligen geschrift keinen grund, ja auch gar nicht darin geschrieben." Lydia

(with its implication of depravity of man) since he strongly felt that an urge for the good is present in every man. The man who could write the tract *Concerning True Love* naturally had little use for a lamentation concerning man's inability to love. In fact, even Pilgram Marpeck, one of the few Anabaptists who developed specific ideas in this area, also stressed what he calls the *Gegenerb* (counterinheritance),[4] meaning the promise to mankind of the coming reconciliation of man through Christ and the message of brotherly love.

It is therefore fitting to ask how Protestantism and Anabaptism, both deriving their doctrines from the Bible, could develop their teachings in such divergent directions. The clue to this puzzle may be found in two arguments: (*a*) The Anabaptists believed in the freedom of the will, though to be sure not of the Pelagian type[5] but rather in the sense that with the help of divine grace man may overcome evil tendencies in his character and obey the divine commandments. Without this freedom of the will discipleship, the heart of Anabaptism, loses its meaning.[5a] (*b*) The Anabaptists believed in and strongly emphasized spiritual rebirth (John 3:3), the transformation of "natural" man into "spiritual" man who now can see his new way, and likewise feels his power (received through a spiritual experience) to resist evil, sin, disobedience to God, pride, and selfishness, which formerly might have dominated his character. Of course, such newly gained strength is never a complete guarantee against possible backsliding (see below, Felbinger's Confession), and life remains a continuous struggle between the two natures of man.

On both points the Reformers took a different direction, remembering Paul's cry of desperation: "For I know that in me dwelleth no good thing" (Rom. 7:18, and similar words), but overlooking his assurance that the believer has actually died to sin. Thus the controversy developed between the Augustinian position on the one hand and the evangelical on the other: the awareness of one's basic corruption versus the divine call to discipleship, something which the Reformers considered well-nigh impossible and indeed held to be a sort of pharisaical self-righteousness and pride.

To understand the Anabaptists' position one must consider their

Müller, *Glaubenszeugnisse oberdeutscher Taufgesinnter* (Leipzig, 1938; further quoted only as Lydia Müller) 233.

4 Pilgram Marpeck, *Antwort auf Kaspar Schwenckfelds Beurteilung des Buches der Bundesbezeugung von 1542*, ed., Johann Loserth (Vienna, 1929; hereafter quoted as *Verantwortung*) 204. *Gegenerbe* in contraposition to *Erbsünde*. Marpeck also speaks of *Erbgnade* (original grace), *ibid.*, 206, 218-220.

5 Marpeck, *Verantwortung*, 209: "Derhalben beschuldigt uns Schwenckfeld unbillig, dass wir Pelagianisch sein, denn wir achten keinen Menschen fromm von geschöpflicher ungefallener natur, wie Adam vor dem Fall war, sondern allein so lang das kind von der schlangen nicht geregiert wird."

5a See *Mennonite Encyclopedia* II (1956), article "Free Will" (where, however, the Pelagian problem is not discussed, likewise not the "Arminian").

scattered utterances concerning man and his predicament. "One must discriminate between *having* sin and *committing* sin," said Claus Felbinger in 1560.[6] Of course, as careful Bible readers the Anabaptists knew very well Paul's thesis that all mankind has inherited from its first parents some corruption, some evil tendencies, and an inclination toward disobedience to God, in short "sin." But this inheritance must under no condition be taken as an inescapable fate which cannot be mended. Hubmaier's booklet *Concerning Free Will* (1527) refers expressly to a passage by the prophet Ezekiel (18:4, and 20) that "the soul that sins shall die" (i.e., the soul may either sin or not sin),[7] and he quotes Ezekiel's dictum that "the son shall not bear the iniquities of the father nor shall the father bear the iniquities of the son." This reference to Ezekiel is particularly significant for Anabaptist thought because it removes the fatalistic character of "inherited" sin which became so oppressive in Protestant orthodoxy and so hopeless as to life's possibilities. Later Peter Riedemann used the same argument in his great *Rechenschaft* of 1540. The *Handbüchlein wider den Prozess* of 1558, which elaborates on this issue, repeats Riedemann's quotation from Ezekiel.

It is quite probable that the idea of original sin came into Anabaptist thought not so much through the Apostle Paul's writings (where the idea is by no means dominating), but rather through the apocryphal book known as "The Fourth Book of Ezra,"[8] which was a favorite of the Anabaptists. In chapters 3 and 7 of this book, often quoted in Anabaptist and Mennonite tracts, the idea of original sin is elaborated upon and lamented. "O thou Adam, what hast thou done! For though it was thou that sinned, thou art not fallen alone but we all that come of thee" (IV Ezra 7:48). But inasmuch as the Anabaptist brotherhoods were gatherings of "reborn" souls who in accepting baptism upon faith had pledged themselves to walk the narrow path and to fight sin, and to help each other in this fight both by discipline and order, this recognition of man's fall did not at all lead to despair and an exclusive "sola fide" theology, as with the Reformers. "We should fear God," wrote Jakob Hutter in 1535, "and be careful concerning our inherent sin[9] and inborn weakness, so that we do not allow that sin any longer to dominate in our mortal body, and also that we will no longer be obedient to sin and the devil and

6 Robert Friedmann, "Claus Felbinger's Confession of 1560," *MQR* XXIX (1955) 158.

7 G. H. Williams, *Spiritual and Anabaptist Writers* (*The Library of Christian Classics*, XXV, Philadelphia, 1957) 127.

8 See *ME* II (1956), article "Ezra, Fourth Book."

9 The German term here used is "anklebende Sünde," that is, a sin which sticks to man's flesh.

may not use our limbs any longer for sinning."[10] This was the meaning of the pledge given at the time of the believer's baptism.

In dealing with the problem of original sin—mainly on the occasion of debates with authorities or when rejecting accusations—the Anabaptists appropriately distinguished between two separate problems: (*a*) the function of original sin in infants who do not yet know the distinction between good and evil, and (*b*) the role and working of original sin in the life of adults before and after conversion.

(*a*) The first problem deals, of course, also with infant baptism as considered necessary by the Catholic Church to save these infants from hell. On this point all Anabaptists were unanimous. Although sin, handed down through the generations through man's Adamic nature, inescapably leads to temporal or physical death ("The wages of sin is death"—an oft-quoted verse in Anabaptist tracts) of both children and adults, it does not mean condemnation to eternal death or hell, since Christ has died for all mankind (no predestination!) and thus reconciled God and man. Thus He died also for the innocent children. In this regard they were sure of God's bountiful grace made efficacious through Christ's supreme sacrifice. Whether we read Riedemann or Marpeck or Menno Simons or the Hessian Confession of 1578, there is no difference on this point:[11] infant baptism as a saving sacrament has no justification in evangelical faith. Indeed to claim that unbaptized children should be eternally lost was in their eyes a climax of blasphemy and an expression of lack of faith.

(*b*) Quite different is the understanding of the brethren concerning sin in adult life. They did not deny its presence or power in the body, the inclination or tendency toward evil (*Neigung* or *Neiglichkeit*), in a still stronger term also "temptation." It is helpful to remember that the Anabaptists shared the radical dualism of the writers of the New Testament, that is, the contraposition of the world of the devil and darkness and the world (or kingdom) of God and of light. Similarly they accepted the Pauline dualism of flesh and spirit, nature and supernature. "Through conversion," Pilgram Marpeck asserts, "man came from nature into supernature (*aus der Natur in die Uebernatur*) and became a spiritual being."[12] Without such dualism the experience of true conversion and rebirth would completely

10 Dr. Hans Fischer, *Jakob Huter, Leben, Frömmigkeit, Briefe* (Newton, 1956), vi-17.

11 See, for instance, "The Confession of the Swiss Brethren in Hesse, 1578," edited by Theodor Sippel, *MQR* XXIII (1949), article "Von den jungen Kindern" (*ibid.*, 33), where we read: "Wir bekennen, dass die kinder selig sein umb der verheissung willen, solange sie in der Einfalt bleiben und weder guts noch bös erkennen, und dass inen von Adam oder angeborner sunde nit zugerechnet wirt, ob sie wol der sundlichen art sein,—sonder durch den tod und blutvergiessen Jesu Christi versunet sein (Col. 1:19-20; I John 2:2)." The references pertain only to the doctrine that Jesus is the reconciliation for our sins and for the whole world.

12 Marpeck, *Verantwortung*, 234, bottom.

lose its existential meaning. As soon as man enteres the new "covenant of a good conscienc with God" (I Peter 3:21), that is through baptism, he is determined to resist this inclination to sin, and will bring his flesh under the discipline (*Zuchtrute*) of the spirit. Only thus can he try to be obedient to God's commandments and be assured that it is possible "to be as pure as the newborn babes" (Ulrich Stadler, 1536, quoting I Peter 2:2).[18]

This was the opinion of practically all Anabaptists and it appears that teachings of this kind must have developed in many places at a rather early date. Sebastian Franck's famous *Chronica, Zeitbuch und Geschichtsbibel* of 1531 contains exactly these ideas as the gist of the Anabaptist position concerning original sin. In the section "Chronica der Römischen Ketzer" (Fol. 447) he says:

> Concerning original sin nearly all Anabaptists teach as follows: just as the righteousness (*Gerechtigkeit*) of Christ is of no avail to anyone unless he makes it a part of his own being through faith, so also Adam's sin (i.e., original sin) does not impair anybody except the one who makes it a part of his own being through faith, and likewise brings forth fruit of this sin. For, as foreign righteousness does not save anybody, so will foreign sin not condemn anybody either. [See below, the reference to Ezek. 18.]
>
> On the other hand, if Adam's sin condemns all men at once merely by its (inherent) nature, it necessarily follows that Christ's righteousness would save all men at once. But if Christ's righteousness saves only those believers who by faith have become transformed into Christ Himself, that is, who no longer live themselves but Christ lives in them, then it follows clearly that Adam's sin likewise condemns only nonbelievers who became Adam not by the mere fact of having been born but by their particular faith or rather unfaith, and by the fact that they bring forth fruit of this kind of faith; in other words, that they are rooted and planted in Him and He in them. That is how they speak of that matter.

On Fol. 446, he says,

> Nearly all Anabaptists consider children to be of pure and innocent blood, and they consider original sin not a sin which of itself condemns both the children and the adults. They also claim that it does not make anyone unclean except the one who accepts this sin, makes it his own, brings forth fruits of it and is unwilling to part from it. For they claim foreign sin does not condemn anybody, and in this they refer to the 18th chapter of Ezekiel.

We shall now discuss in greater detail this concept of original sin as held by the southern Anabaptists, examining first several Hutterite doctrinal writings (1536-58) since they furnish relatively the richest yield, and shall then undertake a similar study in the writings of Pilgram Marpeck, the man whom Horst Quiring rightly claimed

18 Lydia Müller, *loc. cit.*, 233.

to have been one of the very few Anabaptist leaders to develop a real doctrine of original sin.[14]

The earliest Hutterite documents on this point are Ulrich Stadler's two epistles of 1536 to the brethren in Crasniktau in Poland.[15] In them he states categorically, "What does not derive from faith is sin."[16] His first letter has clearly two parts: a gloomy one dealing with God's wrath and punishment, and a hopeful one showing that there is a way out. "The spirit in us that does not consent to sin has pleasure in the Law and agrees that it is good."[17] And then he continues that the new man will certainly receive the strengthening help of Jesus Christ so that the spirit will rule in him and *compel* the flesh to become obedient to this spirit.

It is interesting to find exactly the same phrase in Peter Riedemann's *Rechenschaft*.[18] Repentance brings about a real turning point, after which man begins to "bring his flesh into subjection." But of course this is by no means the entire story. As mentioned above, Riedemann affirms that no one may attain what is good unless he is born again.[19] If Christ had not come into the world, there would be no more hope for life. But now, since He became the reconciliation for the whole world (Col. 1:20; I John 2:2), He has brought it about that original sin, "before it stirreth within man, leading to further sin, now causeth physical death only and not eternal, that the word might be fulfilled: the children shall not bear the iniquities of the fathers but he who sinneth shall himself die. Ezek. 18."[20]

Further, he who is genuinely sorry for his sin must henceforth guard himself against it and flee from it as from a serpent (Ecclus. 21).[21] One must not misinterpret, however, this Hutterite position as gloomy and puritanically stern. Right after this chapter concerning original sin, Riedemann deals joyously with the New Covenant and assures the reader with words taken from the Epistle to the Galatians: "This then is the covenant of childlike freedom of which we also are the children, if and when we submit and surrender ourselves to its working."

14 I must leave it to others to continue such a study with regard to the different religious debates in Switzerland and the Palatinate (mainly the Franckenthal Colloquy), and to Menno Simons and the Dutch Anabaptists. From Neff's article in the *Mennonitisches Lexikon* one can see that more material would be available, although hardly anything new or original.

15 Lydia Müller, *loc. cit.*, 228-234.

16 *Ibid.*, 234.

17 *Ibid.*, 232.

18 See Robert Friedmann, "Peter Riedemann on Original Sin and the Way of Redemption," *MQR* XXVI (1952) 210-215.

19 Peter Rideman, *Account of our Religion, Doctrine and Faith, . . .* (translated by Kathleen E. Hasenberg; Hodder & Stoughton in conjunction with the Plough Publishing House, England, 1950) 57.

20 *Ibid.*, 58.

21 *Ibid.*, 59.

In 1558 a Hutterite brother, probably Peter Walpot, drew up a reply to Melanchthon's (and other Lutheran theologians) pamphlet of 1557, called *Prozess wie es soll gehalten werden,* titled *Handbüchlein wider den Prozess.*[23] In its seventh book or chapter, answer is given to Melanchthon's claim that the Anabaptists teach that children have no original sin. In this tract three different connotations of the idea of original sin are presented, which is perhaps the most succinct exposition of the Anabaptist "theology of sin." (1) Adam fell and drew with him all posterity (IV Ezra 7:48), including infants. The result is temporal death for all, infants and adults. But Christ is the reconciliation of the whole world, hence children will gain God's eternal grace, to be sure without any merit on their part. (2) The other original sin is the sinful inclination of mankind which is found in all. However, if this inclination is not yielded to *(nicht ins Werk gebracht wird),* then it does not condemn or lead to eternal death. "There is . . . now no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus" (Rom. 8:1). (3) "Inheritance" has no power over the one who believes in Christ (apparently he is thinking here of temptations and *Anfechtungen*). "Whosoever is born of God doth not commit sin" (I John 3:9). The *Handbüchlein* repeats once more the reference to Ezekiel, obviously borrowing from the *Rechenschaft.*

In a more practical vein Claus Felbinger repeats the same ideas in his trial before Bavarian authorities at Landshut in 1560. As the child grows, his inclinations to sin will likewise become stronger. "Therefore one must teach them the fear of the Lord and keep them with the rod until they reach understanding."[24] The adult finally, if he desires to enter into the bond of God and to spend his life in godliness, and if this desire is well proved, will be baptized upon confession of faith. But even the devout are never exempt from original sin, that is, the rising urge in the flesh, evil occurrences, and sinful thoughts. It will trouble and sadden them. Although we have died to sin (Rom. 6), original sin still remains with us; as long as man is in the flesh he must fight against it ceaselessly.[25]

Pilgram Marpeck does not add much to the above "theology" except that his presentation is slightly more intellectual. According to Jan Kiwiet,[26] Marpeck followed strongly the line of Hans Denk (a sort of mysticism of love), mainly in his anthropology. He taught that even after Adam's fall God remained a gracious God and did not

22 See article "Bedenken," *ME* I.

23 "The Anabaptists answer Melanchthon. (I) The Handbüchlein of 1558," by W. Wiswedel, and "(II) Some Further Studies Pertaining to the Handbüchlein of 1558," by Robert Friedmann, *MQR* XXIX (1955) 212-231.

24 Claus Felbinger's Confession (see note 6), *MQR* (1955) 159.

25 *Ibid.,* 160.

26 Jan. J. Kiwiet, *Pilgram Marbeck, sein Kreis und seine Theologie* (Kassel, 1957 88 f., 91.

withdraw His breath from man. In other words, the "image of God" (also called "breath of God") remains with man and distinguishes him from the rest of creation.[27] Man, created in God's image and capable of loving, therefore has the freedom of conscience to deliberately accept or reject God's commandments, that is, the freedom to either obey or disobey. Not the flesh, not procreation, not any natural process as such is sinful;[28] rather sin must be understood as being rooted in "knowledge": *Die Sünde steht im Wissen.*

Man is born with a tendency toward evil (as we now know), which tendency can be observed even in a young child,[30] but such a tendency may not yet be called "sin," as it has not become a conscious act of the will. Only conscious acts have the quality of obedience or disobedience, faith or sin,[31] and it is only when we are sinning consciously and deliberately that this inborn tendency may be understood as "original sin." It is at the same time that man is called to repentance and conversion. Baptism upon faith is dying to sin, for it means that we have freely decided for Christ.

Original sin draws its inevitable consquences: a troublesome and sorrowful life, and eventually natural death. And it is universal. Marpeck emphasizes the power and inevitability of sin in man as he comes to the age of knowledge. Marpeck therefore rejects Schwenckfeld's charge that he is a Pelagian, and indeed as Bergsten says, his emphasis on the power and universality of sin "saves him from any Pelagian optimism in his concept of man."[31a] Marpeck however also holds the idea of the real image of God in man even after the Fall (which was also an idea in Hubmaier's writings). Whatever heritage we have received from Adam does not deprive us of our own final responsibility before God. "The old heart is of no avail, therefore God must give us a new heart."[32] Marpeck like all the other Anabaptists refers expressly to Ezekiel 18 as his main locus against an overworked doctrine of original sin. In the *Vermanung* of 1542 we read: "Inasmuch as Ezekiel says that neither the child shall bear

27 At this point Dr. Kiwiet finds a distant similarity with a modern theological doctrine, that of Emil Brunner's thesis of *Anknüpfungspunkte* (man is not totally lost by Adam's fall but some points of contact still remain, which make an encounter of man with God possible and with it the finding of a way back to God).

28 Marpeck, *Verantwortung*, 248: "Schwenckfeld sagt: der ganze natürliche Mensch sei ohne Gnade vor Gott Fleisch. Sagen wir: Das Fleisch ist für sich selbst ein gut Geschöpf Gottes und nicht die Sünde selber, sondern nur eine Wohnung der Sünde. Sonst wissen wir aber wohl. dass ohne Gottes Gnade alles Fleisch nichts ist, aber durch die Gnade ist es das wiedergebrachte Geschöpf Gottes durch Verneuerung seines Heiligen Geistes, der den bösen Geist aus dem Fleisch treibt und den guten in das Herz gibt."

29 Marpeck, *Vermahnung*, in: *Gedenkschrift zum 400-jährigen Jubiläum der Mennoniten* (Ludwigshafen, 1925) 215 and 2431; *Verantwortung*, 213. Kiwiet, *loc. cit.*, 88, 92.

30 *Verantwortung*, 193-195, 198.

31 *Ibid.*, 250, 253.

31a Torsten Bergsten, *Pilgram Marbeck und seine Auseinandersetzung mit Caspar Schwenckfeld* (Uppsala, 1958) 80.

32 *Ibid.*, 248.

the iniquities of the father nor the father the iniquities of the child, who then will charge the unknowing children with sin?"[33]

Horst Quiring, who analyzed Marpeck's anthropology for the first time,[34] concluded from the fact that Marpeck speaks so seldom of man's sinfulness that there is a certain "optimism" in him with regard to his evaluation of man (somewhat like Hans Denk); in other words, Marpeck believes in man's basic capacity to overcome sin and to return to God as God's child. What characterizes Marpeck in particular is his refusal to identify sin and flesh (as many Hutterites seem to have believed), and to center the concept of sin in the "knowledge of good and evil." Even though fallen, man has never lost sight of God, and the way back, though it may be a hard one, is yet a glorious possibility.[35]

33 *Vermahnung*, 242.

34 Horst Quiring, "The Anthropology of Pilgrim Marbeck," *MQR* IX (1935) 155-164.

35 We may learn more about Pilgram Marpeck's idea concerning original sin when his recently discovered epistle *Von der Erbschaft der Sünde*, written in 1545 to his co-worker Leupold Scharnschlager, is published. It is found as number 27 in the *Kunstbuch* of 1561. See Heinold Fast, "Pilgram Marbeck und das oberdeutsche Täufertum," *Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte*, 212 ff. Dr. Fast does not give any information as to the contents of this epistle.

JACOB WISLER AND THE OLD ORDER MENNONITE SCHISM OF 1872 IN ELKHART COUNTY, INDIANA

(Concluded)

JOHN C. WENGER

20. LANCASTER CONFERENCE SUPPORTS FUNK

John Brubaker, a bishop in the Lancaster Conference, gave a rather biased and garbled account of the Ohio Conference decisions, spring session of 1872. The truth was that at this session John M. Brenneman told the conference that he had been accused of partiality, but that he was willing to have the work of the six bishops reviewed and would accompany any such reviewing committee. Bishops J. M. Greider and George Brenneman made similar statements. John Brubaker of Pennsylvania was present and declared himself satisfied with the explanation (record of this in the letter of May 27, 1872, by Joseph F. Summers to David Sherk). Brubaker's statements in Wayne County cannot be explained. Someone must have informed the Lancaster bishops of Brubaker's words, for at the fall conference of 1872 the Lancaster bishops dealt rather severely with Brubaker. Amos Herr, in a letter to Funk, reported that Brubaker was "held to account" before the bishops, and was "reproved for meddling in the Elkhart [County] matters." Brubaker "humbled himself, acknowledged his error, saying he would do anything they laid on him." Bishop George Weaver, Herr reported, was inclined to think that Brubaker ought to apologize personally to Funk. Brubaker had to make an open apology before conference, asking for forgiveness. Herr also reported that Wisler appeared at the conference, "but took a back seat, merely assenting to the charge given by the Bishops." The meaning of this last phrase is not entirely clear. It may mean assenting to the customary "charge" or "testimony" of the bishops to the conference; or perhaps the bishops charged Wisler to accept the decision of the six bishops. It is clear that the Lancaster Conference went on record as endorsing the decision of the six bishops at the fall conference session in 1872.

Funk attended the spring meeting of the Ohio Conference on May 16, 1873, where the Ohio bishops were unable to agree about the Wisler case. Funk reports in his restrained style that

> considerable confusion prevailed and nothing much was done. We, however, concluded that the decision of the Lancaster Conference in reference to the Indiana affairs was confirmed and that it will stand. Bro. J. M. Greider said that in case the decision of the six bishops was not re-examined the decision should stand.

A week later, on May 23, 1873, the Illinois Conference reported, "The decision of the Lancaster Conference to support the decision of the Six Bishops of the Indiana Conference in October, 1871, was considered and adopted."

21. Funk Remonstrates with Josiah Clemmer, 1878

The attitude of the Franconia Conference toward the Elkhart County church problems is not known. Some light is thrown on it by some correspondence between Funk and Josiah Clemmer (1827-1905), a bishop of the Franconia congregation. Clemer wrote Funk on February 17, 1878, and evidently asked if it were true that the Mennonites in Elkhart County had prayer meetings. Funk replied on March 12, 1878, assuring him that not a word of this report was true, but that the Indiana Conference had authorized evening meetings. Funk was particularly disturbed by Clemmer's remarks or questions about Wisler. Funk refers to the letter he had printed about the Wisler matter (according to his diary it was printed the week of September 10, 1877, and mailed "to the ministers and bishops"). He assured Clemmer that nothing would afford him deeper joy than a reunion with Wisler. He then tried to explain the issues between the two groups. When Funk spoke with John Weaver, a Wisler supporter, Weaver had pointed to the Sunday school. Another issue was evening meetings, yet Funk said that seven or eight years earlier he and Wisler had participated in an evening service while on a trip. Wisler had no objection to English preaching "where it was needed." There were also minor point of Mennonite practice in Elkhart County which were not to Wisler's taste: he would have preferred to have the first prayer silent and to have the people remain seated for the benediction, as in the Franconia Conference. Funk told Clemmer that in these items he himself was not at all legalistic, and if these were the only issues the two groups could reunite. Funk was especially annoyed by Clemmer's request that he should return to Wisler; he resented the implication that it was he who had left, whereas in his mind it was Wisler who had left the "Old Mennonite Church," as Funk liked to call it. Incidentally Funk commented that the Lancaster Conference was holding John Brubaker under the ban in 1878 because of his role in the Wisler division in eastern Ohio, in Wayne and Medina counties. Funk's strongest point was his reminder to Clemmer that in the East everyone holds Conference in high regard; what Conference does is to be respected. And that is right, said Funk. He declared that he had often wished that this attitude also prevailed in the West, Wisler not excepted. Funk reminded

Clemmer that "we in the West" always supported the decisions of the Eastern Conferences. When John M. Holdeman was dealt with, the Western brethren supported the Eastern Conferences. We did not, declare Funk pointedly, write you letters, and blame you, and counsel you to go to Holdeman and reunite with him! Finally Funk insisted that Clemmer had an exaggerated concept of the animosities existing in Elkhart County. Just the day before he wrote, said Funk, one of Wisler's strongest supporters had stopped, and Funk purchased corn from him and had a friendly visit with him. This man was then holding singing school alternately on Saturdays and Sunday afternoons in the meetinghouse in which both groups were worshiping alternately, and the young people of both groups were attending the singing school. We go to Wisler or Weaver (Funk calls him "Weber" in German) or others, and everything takes place with the best friendliness. He told Clemmer that if he would come out to Indiana, he would take him to see Wisler for a visit. In a postscript Funk begged Clemmer to tell him who had written these erroneous reports to him. He said that it might be hard to bear, but he would like to know where it came from.

22. Progress Through the Storm, 1865-75

Through these years of trouble, from the middle sixties through the division of 1872 and beyond, John M. Brenneman continued to stand by the congregations of Northern Indiana. On October 19, 1865, he went to Lakeville in St. Joseph County, to the little flock which worshiped in a school-house near the cemetery which still remains (two miles south of Lakeville and one and one-half miles west), and ordained P. Y. Lehman as preacher, and Michael Shank as deacon. Three days later he ordained William Pletcher as preacher in the Clinton (Brick) congregation. On April 28, 1866, he went to Bowne, Michigan, and ordained Herman Bentler as deacon, and Peter Keim as preacher. Three days later he ordained Henry Wismer as preacher at near-by Caledonia. On January 11, 1867, he ordained Samuel Yoder as preacher for the little congregation which met in Mixel's school house near Crumstown in St. Joseph County. On August 26, 1867, he went to the Pleasant Hill Congregation in Branch County, Michigan, and ordained Christian D. Beery as preacher.

In all his good work in the church Brenneman's right hand man was Henry Yother (sometimes called Yoder), the bishop in Livingston County, Illinois. As early as May 17, 1864, Brenneman wrote to Funk: "My intended visit to the west will now be given up. Bro.

Henry Yoder of Fayette Co., Pa., is on his way to Illinois and will do the work otherwise required of me." On March 19, 1868, Henry Yother ordained Jacob A. Beutler as preacher in the Holdeman congregation in Elkhart County. Four days later, on March 23, Yother ordained Abraham Blosser as deacon for Pleasant Hill in Michigan. On June 28, 1868, Bishop George Brenneman of Putnam County, Ohio, a brother of John M. Brenneman, ordained James Coyle as preacher in the Pleasant Valley congregation in DeKalb County, Indiana. On December 22, 1869, Yother ordained C. D. Beery to the office of bishop in the Pleasant Hill congregation, Michigan. Two years later, on November 2, 1871, John M. Brenneman and C. D. Beery, the new bishop, ordained James Culbertson as an additional preacher in the Holdeman congregation in Elkhart County. On December 23, 1871, the same bishops ordained Henry Shaum as preacher and Henry Christophel (father of J. S. Hartzler's second wife Catherine) as deacon in the Shaum congregation (now Olive) in Elkhart County. It will be observed that all these ordinations were for southern Michigan or northern Indiana, yet the bishops stayed away from Bishop Wisler's home congregation, Yellow Creek. But finally on March 25, 1872, eleven weeks and two days after Wisler's final suspension at Yellow Creek, John M. Brenneman, accompanied by C. D. Beery, ordained Christian Christophel as a preacher at Yellow Creek. On June 12, 1872, Bishop Brenneman ordained Jacob H. Wisler, a nephew of the bishop, as deacon in the Blosser meetinghouse in Elkhart County. The final step was to provide the bishop oversight for the Elkhart County Mennonites now that Bishop Wisler was the leader in a new branch of the church. It was decided to ordain two bishops. Accordingly, on October 18, 1872, John M. Brenneman ordained John M. Christophel (53) and Jacob A. Beutler (39) as bishops in the Yellow Creek meetinghouse. The two men were actually joint bishops, but Christophel served mostly Yellow Creek, Blosser, and Nappanee (North Main Street), while Beutler served Holdeman, Olive, and Elkhart (Prairie Street). On June 22, 1873, Martin E. Kreider was ordained preacher for the numerically week Christophel District, probably at the Blosser meetinghouse, for Allen Christophel spoke of him as being a preacher in the Blosser congregation. It is not known who ordained Kreider.

23. The Two Groups in 1875

Bishop Jacob Wisler (66) was assisted in his work at Yellow Creek, Blosser, and Shaum by Christian Bare (59) and John B. Weaver (54), both of whom had been preachers for about nineteen

years, and deacons Tobias Ramer (51) and John Troxel (50). Nov. 2, 1875, Wisler ordained Martin A. Hoover (41) to the office of preacher.

Bishops Beutler (41) and Christophel (56) were assisted at Yellow Creek, Olive, Holdeman, Blosser, Nappanee, and Elkhart by preachers John F. Funk (40), Henry Shaum (49), James Culbertson, Christian Christophel (55), and Martin E. Kreider (36), and by deacons David B. Martin (46), Henry B. Brenneman (43), Joseph Holdeman (42), Henry Christophel (49), and Jacob H. Wisler (41). (Sometime after 1879 Martin went over to the Wisler Conference.) The ministers at Lakeville, P. Y. Lehman (38) and Michael Shank (41), and at Crumstown, Samuel Yoder (40), also followed Funk.

No records were kept of the exact number of members who followed Wisler in the 1872 schism. One clew is the ratio of the votes on August 17, 1867; i.e., 132 against Wisler' resuming preaching, and 119 in favor. These proportions may have changed somewhat by 1872. And these numbers are of course confined to the members present at Yellow Creek when the vote was taken. It is not known to what degree Olive, Holdeman, Blosser, and Christophel had become separately organized into their several congregational memberships by 1872. The Prairie Street congregation in Elkhart had begun its services on December 4, 1870, and was still very small in 1872. Leah Lehman Bechtel, who was one hundred years old in 1959, and who was living in Williams County, Ohio, when the 1872 division occurred, rather thinks that Wisler got two thirds of the Mennonites west of Goshen in Elkhart County. But the judgment of Samuel D. Culp (born 1860), of Columbiana, Ohio, a cousin to Wisler's three sons-in-law, is probably more reliable: he thinks that Wisler got "hardly a third" of the members in the division. In 1931 Jacob W. Christophel (1856-1937), bishop of the Yellow Creek congregation, reported that Wisler took a small group with him, "perhaps about one hundred."[1] This is probably as accurate a report as we can get. The number of members remaining with Funk in the Indiana Conference may be estimated as possibly three or four hundred; we know, for example, that at Olive twenty-seven were baptized and one was received by letter, on June 9, 1872. By 1888 the strongest Mennonite congregation in the county was Holdeman (John S. Coffman diary).

On Christmas Day of 1867, the "ministers and deacons met at Jones' school house and concluded on dividing the church into dis-

1 Milo Franklin Kauffman, *The Rise and Development of Sunday Schools in the Mennonite Church in Indiana.* M.A. in Rel. Ed. thesis, Presbyterian Theological Seminary, Chicago, 1931, p. 55.

tricts so as to give each [meeting] house its congregation, minister, and deacon" (J. F. Funk diary, December 25, 1867). In the extant Funk papers there is a sheet of explanations on the division into districts, and a hand-drawn map showing Elkhart, Salem (called Wakarusa officially since 1859), and the several Mennonite congregations of the county: Shaum, Holdeman, Harrison [Yellow Creek], Blosser, and the Culp schoolhouse. The map shows the Frisian Mennonites as living in Jackson Township. The four districts agreed upon are defined as follows: (1) *Christophel's, Culp's,* and *Blosser's:* bounded on the north by the south line of Harrison Township, and on the west by the township line west of Union. (2) *Yellow Creek*: all of Harrison Township including the Jones schoolhouse. (3) *Holdeman*: bounded on the east by the east township line of Locke, and four miles of Olive Township, thence on a straight line west including the Troxel schoolhouse. (4) *Shaum*: bounded on the east by the east township line of Baugo, and two miles of the east line of Olive [Township], and on the south by the section line running west two miles south of the meetinghouse. The sheet has written on it what were undoubtedly Funk's suggestions for the improvement of the services of that era: Meetings should commence at 10:00 o'clock; meetings should not be kept too long; two hours is long enough; young converts should be faithfully examined and taught. It is entirely probable that these suggestions were adopted. Funk's diary makes no mention of these three rules.

24. Futile Efforts to Heal the Schism

It will likely never be fully known how many efforts were made to reunite the church after the fateful meeting of January 6, 1872, when Bishop Wisler and his supporters were read out of the brotherhood. In his letter to Josiah Clemmer (1878) Funk wrote:

> Now, Dear Brother, I wrote in my printed letter that we had visited Wisler four times, or we went to him seeking peace. At that time I did not wish to write more than I could substantiate with clear words. . . . I said four times, but how many more it was I also cannot write to you now. We often went to Wisler to seek a reunion, but it never came to anything. But it is not said thereby that we are without fault. . . .

In his diary for August 9, 1877, Funk wrote:

> Went to Holdeman's Harvest Meeting. Well attended. I spoke in English from Joel 2:21-27. At noon we went to Bro. Beidler's and counseled in relation to the re-examination of the decision of the Six Bishops with regard to the Wisler difficulty. Bro. Shaum and I went to see John Weaver, and he said he was opposed to calling any more men to examine it, because every time men came [1867-71]

the matter became worse. They were peaceful and quiet in their church, and he believed it to be good enough. And if we could not all be of one mind, we would better be separate than together. They had kept up the old ordinances [regulations], rules, and doctrine, and if we were willing to let ours go and come to them, and be of one mind with them, we could do so, and we could get along together. Otherwise we could not.

We also called on Wisler. He also feared that if another examination was instituted, the same men that were here before would again be here, and would make the bishops believe what was not true. He thought he had been unjustly dealt with, and they had a nice peaceful church, and were well satisfied as it was. He was not willing that any other way of examining the matter should be adopted then the one proposed by the Ohio Conference of three years ago. [He] did not know whether it would make the matter any better. Would think over the matter, etc. He denied that he had condemned the Sunday schools at the time the complaints had been brought against them. I told him, he must have forgotten it. He had not thought that they would ask or desire another examination, etc.

Weaver said [that] Sunday schools had caused all these troubles. I thought not. The stirring up of an old settled matter was the cause, etc.

On Friday, August 24, 1877, fifteen days after Funk and Shaum saw Weaver and Wisler, Funk met Wisler at the funeral of a son of Deacon Jacob H. Wisler, a youth named Harvey. Funk

inquired of [Bishop Wisler] as to whether they desired again a re-examination of the decisions of the six bishops . He said that they had decided that they would not make another call for re-examination, as each attempt [in the years 1867-1871] had so far made it worse. If we wanted anything different, we could come over to them, and leave our new things, and it would be all right.

Four years later, at the Fall Conference of 1881 Preacher Henry Shaum

stated that recently one of the ministers of [the Wisler group] came to him, manifesting a very earnest desire that some steps be taken toward a reunion of the church, requesting that the subject be presented before this conference and that he would also see that it was laid before their conference which would be held at the same time in Ohio.

The conference received the request favorably, and the following resolution was unanimously adopted: Resolved that this conference extend a hearty welcome to that part of the church known as the "Wisler Church," to unite again with the church, and [we] are willing to take such steps as may be necessary for a reunion as will not conflict with previous established decisions. But this overture and response were without fruit.[2]

2 It may be mentioned that Henry Shaum, who brought the matter before Conference in 1881, had a brother, Christian Shaum, a man of a strong personality and possessed with broad Christian charity, who was ordained to the ministry on May 23 of that year. A year later, on

Space does not permit the discussion of all the futile efforts for reunion. At the conference at Yellow Creek on October 8 and 9, 1874, Bishop John Shaum of Wayne County, Ohio, took a prominent place. He read a letter from Sauders Station (now Souderton, Pennsylvania) signed by Benjamin Herr, an aged bishop of the Lancaster Conference, and by two Franconia Conference bishops, Isaac Oberholtzer and Josiah Clemmer, which urged a reconciliation in the church in Elkhart County. Clemmer also wrote his own personal letter pleading for a church reunion, as did Bishop J. M. Greider of Greene County, Ohio, one of the six bishops who had adjudicated the troubles in 1871. The minutes of the 1874 Indiana Conference simply note that these three letters were read and opportunity was given for questions. To this day the division persists.

25. Wisler Founds a Conference, 1872

Bishop Jacob Wisler had a deep interest in the welfare of the Mennonite church at large. He used to go back to the Oberholtzer (now Midway) Church in Ohio. He sometimes attended the Ohio Conference (e.g., 1866). He attended the Lancaster Conference in the fall of 1872. In 1861 he visited his boyhood community in Bucks County, Pennsylvania, and worshiped at the Deep Run meeting on May 12 of that year. In the fall of 1872 he was there again.[3] (Bishop Christian Shaum of Indiana visited Deep Run, accompanied by Joseph, Amos, and Abraham Shaum, on September 15, 1889.)

In the spring of 1872 Jacob Wisler went to Wayne County, Ohio, and organized a conference of Mennonite bishops, preachers, and deacons. The meeting, according to the late M. S. Steiner, was held in the home of Henry Beery (1826-1897), who had been ordained preacher in 1858. Beery lived in Wayne County but was a minister in the Medina County congregation. Wisler, say Hartzler and Kauffman in their history, attended the spring session of the Ohio Conference in Leetonia in 1872, "but not finding the support he desired, he with several ministers withdrew and called a conference at Pre. Beery's home . . . a few weeks later."[4] The Wisler leaders in Ohio, some of whom evidently did not unite with the Wisler group until some time after its formation, were bishops Abraham Rohrer (1788-1878) of Medina County, John Shaum (1797-1882) of Wayne County, Peter Imhoff (1806-1893) of Ashland County, Isaac Hoffer (1799-1880) of Williams County, John M. Greider (1823-1891) of Green County, and Isaac Kilmer of Crawford County; preachers Isaac Rohr-

May 21, 1882, he became the second Wisler bishop in Indiana. Might he have been the preacher who approached Henry Shaum about a possible reunion?

3 Records of Jacob K. Overholt, a deacon in the Deep Run congregation.

4 J. S. Hartzler and Daniel Kauffman, *Mennonite Church History* (Scottdale, 1905), 340.

er (1814-1896) of Seneca County and Jacob Kaempher of Wood County were of one mind with Wisler. The Wisler congregation in the Ohio counties of Ashland, Green, Montgomery, Crawford, Seneca, Wood, and Williams all died out in the course of time by migration or by loss of their young people, or both. John Umble has written much of this story in previous issues of the *Review*.[5]

26. Wisler Mennonite Places of Worship

The Elkhart County Wisler Mennonites alternated with the Indiana Conference Mennonites in the use of the Yellow Creek, Blosser, and Shaum meetinghouses, and about 1877 built a new house of worship on Section 21 of Madison Township, in St. Joseph County, on the Elkhart County line about midway between the New and Osborne county roads; the deed was not given until 1891. When the (Funk) Mennonites built a new meetinghouse, which was named Salem, on the southeast corner of the intersection of Elkhart County roads 13 and 46 (Sec. 14 of Union Township), the Wisler group two years later (1891) built a new Blosser meetinghouse to replace the old log building. Blosser's is located on the southeast corner of the intersection of Elkhart county roads 9 and 46 (Sec. 16 of Union Township). The 1891 Blosser meetinghouse was renovated in 1947. The 1861 Yellow Creek meetinghouse was renovated about 1900, and enlarged in 1953/54. The Wisler Mennonites gave up the use of the Shaum meetinghouse about 1888, when the new meetinghouse was built. The County Line meetinghouse was abandoned as a house of worship in 1950.

27. Elkhart County Wisler Ministers, 1872-1907

The following served in the Elkhart County Wisler Mennonite Church from its founding in 1872 until 1907 (when the Wisler Mennonites divided into two groups, the more progressive Wisler or "Ramer" Mennonites, and the more conservative Old Order or "Martin" Mennonites who withdrew from the Wisler Conference of Ohio and Indiana under the leadership of Bishop John W. Martin): Bishop Jacob Wisler, originally of Bucks County, Pennsylvania, ordained preacher in Ohio in 1833, and bishop in Indiana in 1851; Christian Bare (1816-1904), of Rockingham County, Virginia, ordained preacher in Putnam County, Ohio, in 1856, moved to Elkhart County, Indiana, in 1857; John Troxel (1826-1907), ordained deacon by 1867; John B. Weaver (1821-1907), ordained preacher by Bishop George Weaver at Weaverland, Lancaster County, Pennsylvania, in

5 John S. Umble, "Extinct Mennonite Churches in Ohio," *MQR* XVIII-XX (1944-1946).

1856; moved to Elkhart County in 1868; Tobias Ramer (1824-1887), ordained deacon by 1869; David B. Martin (1829-1902), ordained deacon by 1869; Martin A. Hoover (1834-1895), ordained preacher on November 2, 1875; Christian Shaum (1828-1903), ordained preacher on May 23, 1881, and bishop May 21, 1882, to assist the aging Bishop Wisler; David Newcomer (1818-1887), a deacon; Elias Z. Martin (1843-1909), ordained deacon about 1884; Joel Snider (1847-1898), ordained deacon in 1886; David Wisler (1830-1902), son of the bishop, ordained deacon possibly about 1887 after the death of Tobias Ramer and David Newcomer; Martin Ramer (1858-1928), son of Tobias Ramer, ordained preacher on May 21 or 22, 1887; Henry Schrock (1862-1946), ordained preacher in 1894; John W. Martin (1852-1940), brother of Elias Martin, and son of Henry Martin (1807-1873), deacon at Weaverland, Lancaster County, Pennsylvania, ordained preacher May 17, 1896, and bishop May 20, 1899, to assist the aging Bishop Christian Shaum; Isaac Martin (1854-1911), ordained deacon on Whitsunday, May 26, 1901; and Christian Z. Weaver (1848-1939), son of John B. Weaver, ordained preacher on May 21, 1903.

28. The 1907 Division in the Wisler Conference

The 1907 division occurred over the persistent Mennonite problem of church discipline. Bishop John W. Martin and his fellow ministers, supported by many of the Ohio ministers, were of a conservative turn of mind, while Bishop Henry Hursh (1839-1916), a man considerably older than Martin, who had served as a bishop for about twenty-nine years as compared with the eight years of Martin, was of a more flexible mind. The telephone was the bone of contention. Martin opposed it, while Hursh thought it could be tolerated.

In the Wisler *verses* Brenneman and Funk troubles over the Sunday school, bass singing, and similar issues, John B. Weaver had stood firmly by Wisler in his conservative attitudes. But now that Weaver was almost eighty-six years old in 1907 it broke his heart to think of the Wisler group dividing. He evidently was in correspondence with Bishop Hursh, the venerable leader of the Ohio and Indiana (Wisler) Conference, and was either instructed by him or encouraged by him to appeal to Martin for more leniency on the use of the telephone as the following letter shows:

January 22nd 1907

Bro. John Martin:

May the grace of God rest upon you is our wish and prayer.

By request of Bro. Henry Hursh, a number of us have come together to see if we could give an advice in regard to the troubles that have arisen among us.

We believe that it is according to God's Word to drop everything and again go hand in hand as we did a few years ago, forgive each other, and bear [with] each other in love and patience in regard to the 'phone matter. We believe that the discord in the church is much more grievous in the sight of the Lord than the 'phone. Follow peace with all men, and holiness, without which no man shall see the Lord. Heb. 12:14. We hope you will agree with us, and try to restore peace in the church.

Signed by

PRE. JOHN WEAVER
A. B. WEAVER
LEVI A. RESSLER
HENRY A. WEAVER
SAMUEL WENGER
ISAAC LEINBACH

Another appeal (undated) was sent to the two Ohio Wisler bishops, Henry Hursh and Isaac L. Good, asking them to invetigate the situation in the Elkhart County church. This petition was signed by thirty-two men. Perhaps in response to this petition the two bishops met with Bishop Martin on May 15, 1907, in Martin's home. Martin refused to talk. "Ich hab' nichs zu sage. Ich bin gedemmft" (freely translated: "I have nothing to say. Because of your attitude I am in no mood to enter into a discussion with you."). He told Hursh that if he had anything to say, he could say it. But Hursh replied that if he would not talk, they would not say anything either.

The actual division occurred in the spring meeting of the semi-annual Ohio and Indiana (Wisler) Mennonite Conference which met in the County Line meetinghouse in St. Joseph County, Indiana, on May 17, 1907. The leader of the Conference was Hursh, a bishop since 1878. He was assisted by Isaac L. Good, a bishop since 1891. Martin, the youngest of the three bishops, had been ordained as bishop only eight years before this. But Martin was an able and determined man, and he must have been able to persuade most of the other members of Conference that it was necessary to tighten up the discipline of the Conference.

As the bishops, preachers, and deacons assembled in the County Line meetinghouse, the bishops Hursh and Good, preacher John Weaver of Indiana, and deacons Samuel Good and Abraham Newcomer of Ohio entered the meetinghouse, took off their overcoats and sat down.[6] But Bishop Martin and ten preachers and four deacons, the party which stood with him, remained outside the building counseling together. When it was time for the meeting to begin

6 The following account is a condensation of a document which has been preserved by the Wisler Mennonites, and which was attested by three brethren who singly or together were eye witnesses of the events described: Noah Weaver, John B. Weaver, and Samuel S. Wenger.

Martin and his fourteen followers entered the auditorium and took their seats. Martin went forward and greeted with the holy kiss the brethren Henry Hursh, Isaac Good, and John Weaver. (Weaver was at this point a feeble old man of 85; he died later that year.) Martin then asked bishops Hursh and Good, and deacons Samuel Good and Abraham Newcomer—all four from Ohio—to go with him into the council room, which they did. In the council room Martin castigated Hursh for misrepresentation, and then said that the ministers had decided no longer to tolerate the telephone. Hursh replied that he could not accept the charges which Martin brought against him, and that on the issue of the telephone he still stood on the same platform as they had always had, namely, that the church would in love and patience bear with those members who had telephones. Hursh then pointed out to Martin that he and some of the other ministers had been working behind the backs of the older bishops and taking their own way, thereby causing much trouble in the church. This interview lasted about fifteen minutes.

When the five returned into the auditorium Hursh and Good took their place on the pulpit, the two deacons took seats in the audience, but Martin, still carrying his hat and overcoat, and wearing his scarf, walked to the rear of the auditorium and sat down. Hursh sorrowfully reported to the Conference the charges made by Martin, adding that he could not accept them but that he would not say much. When Hursh sat down, Martin arose, took a few steps forward, and reported that he would say a few words and would then withdraw. Martin said that he saw that they could not go on together any longer. Nor can we, said he, any longer tolerate the telephone. We do not want to separate as enemies, however, but as friends. He admitted that to separate "goes far" and means much, as it would affect family ties and relationships. Martin addressed Hursh, saying that he (Hursh) wanted to hold conference, and so did "we" (Martin and his supporters), and since the building was not large enough for both, "I will now withdraw, and those that are in unity with me can come along."

At this point Martin (54) walked out, followed by ten preachers and four deacons. The preachers were Christian Weaver (58), Martin Ramer (48), and Henry Schrock (45), of Indiana; Jacob Weaver (60), Abraham Brubaker (72), Daniel Brubaker (34), Peter Imhoff (63), and Daniel Martin (51), of Ohio; and Daniel G. Brubacher (36) and Henry Brenneman (44) of Michigan. The deacons were Elias Martin (63; brother of Bishop Martin) and Isaac Martin (52), of Indiana; Michael Shaum (65) and Jacob Burkhart (41), of Ohio;

this made a total of fourteen schismatic ordained men. Only five Conference men were left in the County Line meetinghouse: bishops Henry Hursh (68) and Isaac L. Good (66); preacher John Weaver (85); and deacons Abraham Newcomer (68) and Samuel Good (61). Martin and his supporters held their conference in the home of Joseph Shaum, the man who had contributed the land for the County Line meetinghouse, and who lived close to it. In deep sorrow these five remaining ministers then held their spring conference in the County Line meetinghouse at the usual time and place. A number of Ohio Wisler Mennonites who were not present at the 1907 Conference also followed Hursh: for example, two preachers, Jacob Newcomer (64) and Edwin Koppes (35), and a deacon, Abraham Rohrer (83), all of Medina County.

30. The Progressive Group, Elkhart County, 1907-58

Thus all the active ordained men in the Elkhart County Wisler Mennonite Church withdrew with John W. Martin into his more conservative Old Order group. Only the aged John Weaver (85) remained in the Ohio and Indiana (Wisler) Mennonite Conference. But two thirds of the Elkhart County laity remained with Weaver in the Wisler Conference. In the summer of 1907 Hursh and Good came to Yellow Creek and took their vote on the ordination of ministers to serve them. On July 21, 1907, they ordained Levi A. Ressler (1848-1939, the brother of India missionary J. A. Ressler) to the office of deacon, and Levi's son Christian L. Ressler (1879-1958) to the office of preacher. A few months later Martin Ramer, a preacher who had initially followed John W. Martin, decided to return to the more progressive group. Preacher John B. Weaver died on his eighty-sixth birthday anniversary, September 2, 1907. So by the close of 1907 the Yellow Creek Wisler congregation had two preachers and a deacon. And four years later, on November 6, 1911, Ramer was ordained as bishop of the Wisler Church in Elkhart County. By the spring of 1919, Bishop Ramer being 70 years of age, and C. L. Ressler having left the community, William Ramer (1890-), a son of Bishop Martin Ramer, was ordained to the ministry on May 19, 1919, by Bishop Moses G. Horst of Medina County, Ohio. The next year, on May 21, 1920, John W. Martin ordained John M. Weaver (1873-1952), son of preacher Christian Z. Weaver, deacon; he was the son-in-law of Christian L. Ressler. Weaver later transferred to the more progressive Wisler group. On November 2, 1925, Noah W. Wenger (1895-1931), whose mother was a daughter of John B. Weaver, was ordained preacher by Moses G. Horst. He died of

appendicitis at the age of 35 on March 20, 1931. On October 2, 1926, Jacob H. Bechtel (1870-1948) was ordained deacon by Horst; his widow Leah Lehman Bechtel, daughter of Abraham Lehman (1824-1900), a bishop of Williams County, Ohio, was born in 1859, and is still living. On May 20, 1929, Moses G. Horst, assisted by Moses G. Horning of Lancaster County, and by Daniel C. Witmer of Wayne County, Ohio, ordained William Ramer to the office of bishop. On May 18, 1931, Paul Hoover (1904-), grandson of Preacher Martin A. Hoover, was ordained preacher by bishops Moses G. Horst, and William Ramer, assisted by Thomas Reesor of Ontario. The last ordination was performed on May 23, 1948, when William Henry Bechtel (1895-), son of Deacon Jacob H. Bechtel (who had died eleven days previously), was ordained to the office of deacon by William Ramer. The 1958 ministry in the progressive Elkhart County group therefore consists of William Ramer (68) bishop, Joseph E. Martin (70) and Paul Hoover (54) preachers, and William Henry Bechtel (63) deacon. The more conservative group has younger leadership than does the more progressive body.

31. The 1947 Schism in the Old Order Group

It will be observed that the two bishops in each of the two groups were father and son: John W. Martin and Joseph E. Martin in the Old Order group, and Martin Ramer and William Ramer in the Wisler group. The former drive only by horse and buggy, while the latter use black automobiles and paint the chrome black also. In 1947 Joseph E. Martin withdrew from his Old Order group because of various difficulties in discipline and administration and stood independent for a time. In 1950 he and his followers, about one third of the Old Order congregation, affiliated themselves with the Wisler ("Ramer") Mennonites. The progressive Wisler group had in 1958 about two hundred members in Elkhart County, while the conservative Old Order group had one hundred members.

32. The Ministry in the Conservative Group, 1907-58

Isaac Martin died in 1911. His successor as deacon, ordained soon after, was Isaac M. Brubaker (1860-1936); he was ordained at the County Line meetinghouse, but served less than ten years in Elkhart County, for in 1920 he moved to Lancaster County. The next ordination occurred on May 25, 1924, when John W. Martin ordained his son Joseph E. Martin (1888-) as preacher in a service held in the County Line meetinghouse (which is one mile west of the Holdeman meetinghouse, and a mile and a half north). A

little over eight years later, on October 9, 1932, Bishop Martin ordained his brother, Henry E. Martin (1885-), as preacher, at the Blosser meetinghouse. On May 19, 1934, Joseph E. Martin was ordained bishop at Yellow Creek to assist his aged father, who died six and one-half years later (December 9, 1940). Five months later, on October 27, 1935, Bishop John W. Martin ordained Menno Ramer (1880-) to the office of deacon.[7] William G. Weaver (1922-) was ordained to the office of preacher by Bishop Aaron Z. Sensenig of Lancaster County, on June 5, 1950, to succeed J. E. Martin; three years later on June 2, 1953, Sensenig, assisted by bishops Daniel Brubaker and Addison Gingerich, ordained Weaver to the office of bishop, both ordinations taking place at the Yellow Creek (frame) meetinghouse. Enos S. Martin (1916-), son of Preacher Henry E. Martin, was ordained preacher on June 19, 1951, by Aaron Sensenig. And Ralph Martin (1928-), grandson of Deacon Isaac Martin, was ordained deacon by the new bishop, William G. Weaver, on June 15, 1954, at Yellow Creek. One more man has served in the Old Order ministry in Elkhart County: he is Harvey Horst (1874-) of Stark County, Ohio. Horst was ordained preacher in the Pleasant View meetinghouse, Mahoning County, Ohio, on May 31, 1908. He was chosen by the vote of the church; contrary to the Wisler custom, no lot was used. He served in the Wisler ministry in Ohio (the progressive group) until 1928 when he removed to Virginia and joined the more conservative group led there by Bishop John Dan Wenger of Dayton, Virginia. He located in Elkhart County in 1947. The 1958 Conservative ministry therefore consists of Bishop William G. Weaver (36), preachers Harvey Horst (23), Henry E. Martin (73), and Enos S. Martin (42), and deacons Menno Ramer (78) and Ralph Martin (29).

33. The 1872 Division in Ohio

Extinct Wisler congregations of Ohio[8] include the congregation in Ashland County under Bishop Peter Imhoff (1806-1893), those in Crawford and Richland counties under Bishop Isaac Kilmer, in Seneca County under Preacher Isaac Rohrer (1814-1896), in Green, Montgomery, and Clark counties under Bishop John M. Greider (1823-1891), in Wood County under the preachers Jacob Kaempher, Henry Pletcher, Jacob Tyson, and Henry Tyson, and in Williams County under Bishop Isaac Hoffer (1799-1880). The permanent

7 Mention has already been made of the withdrawal of Bishop J. E. Martin and his followers from the Old Order group in 1947 and the merger of his group with the more progressive Wisler body in 1950.

8 See footnote 5.

Wisler congregations in Ohio are as follows: (1) The Maple Hill (former Lower) congregation, near Wadsworth, Medina County, Ohio; (2) the County Line and Chestnut Ridge and (3) Chester congregations in Wayne County, and (4) the Pleasant View congregation in Mahoning County.

Few records have been kept by the Wisler Mennonites; the 1907 schism from Conference may have changed the time and place of conference. In the group to which John F. Funk adhered, the "Mennonite Church," it was long the custom to hold the Conference in Ohio in the spring, and the Conference in Indiana in the fall. At first this ministers' conference was not sharply divided by states. The Wisler Conference also met semiannually prior to 1907. The Old Order group founded by John W. Martin of Indiana in 1907, now meets annually on the third Friday in May. It used to be called the Ohio, Indiana, and Michigan Conference, but only about two preachers and eight lay members are left (1958) in Ohio, and one member in Michigan. Consequently, the meetings are now always held annually in Indiana. On the other hand, the more progressive faction, who call themselves the Wisler Mennonites, have a conference which is called the Ohio and Indiana Mennonite Conference (or Indiana and Ohio Conference) which convenes semiannually: on the fourth Friday of April at the Yellow Creek meetinghouse in Indiana, and on the second Friday of October at the Pleasant View meetinghouse in Mahoning County, Ohio.

The Mennonite preachers and deacons who followed Jacob Wisler in 1872 in Medina County were: Abraham Rohrer (1788-1878), ordained preacher about 1829, and bishop in 1836; Michael Rohrer (1812-1895), ordained preacher in 1850; Henry Beery (1826-1897), ordained preacher in 1858; in the congregation which worshiped in the County Line and Chestnut Ridge meetinghouses in Yayne County there is no record of any ordained men following Wisler; in the Chester congregation in Wayne County the entire group, both preachers and laity, followed Wisler, including John Shaum (1797-1882), formerly of Northampton County, Pennsylvania, ordained preacher in 1830, and bishop about 1864; Preacher Peter Troxel (1804-1895), father of Indiana deacon John Troxel; Peter Y. Landis (1832-1897), ordained as preacher in the year 1865; and Preacher Peter Imhoff (1844-1911), formerly of Ashland County; in the Pleasant View congregation of Mahoning County, Preacher Samuel Good (1810-1883) and deacons David Weaver (1819-1890) and Christian Lehman (1832-1912).

34. Wisler Mennonites in Medina County

Most of the Mennonites of Medina County followed Wisler in 1872 and withdrew from the Ohio Mennonite Conference. The Medina County Mennonites were at that time worshiping in two meetinghouses, what is now called the Maple Hill meetinghouse built in 1833, and the Guilford meetinghouse, built in 1855/56. The Wisler group, being in the majority and having all the ministers except Deacon Jacob Kreider (1818-1896)—the father of the Ohio Conference preacher Jonas M. Kreider (1857-1933)—claimed both meetinghouses and refused to let Jacob Kreider and his twenty-five members use either house. This remnant felt that they had a legal and moral right to worship in at least one of the two meetinghouses. Upon the advice of the Ohio Conference (from which the majority had withdrawn to follow Wisler) they quietly had a key made for the Guilford meetinghouse and used it until 1893, when they built the Bethel meetinghouse (remodeled 1939). This act, contrary to the wishes of the Wisler congregation, did not enhance good relations with the Wisler congregation. When the Wisler congregation rebuilt the 1833 meetinghouse in 1880 the Ohio Conference group under Deacon Kreider and Preacher Martin Leatherman (1823-1901; ordained Oct. 2, 1880) offered to help the Wisler group in the project, but their help was refused.

The Wisler Mennonites have added the following to the ministry in Medina County: Isaac L. Good (1841-1917), ordained preacher in 1873 and bishop in 1891; Abraham Rohrer (1825-1915), ordained deacon in 1873 (he was the son of Bishop Abraham Rohrer who ordained Wisler as bishop in Indiana in 1851); Abraham Newcomer (1839-1928), ordained deacon in 1881; Jacob Newcomer (1843-1903), ordained preacher in 1897; and Edwin Koppes (1869-1913), ordained preacher in 1904. The two Newcomers were brothers. These five men all followed the Wisler Conference leader, Bishop Henry Hursh of Wayne County, in the 1907 division. After 1907 the following were added to the ministry: Moses G. Horst (1875-), ordained preacher in 1913, and bishop in 1916; Abram Good (1891-), son of Bishop Isaac Good, ordained preacher in 1917; Alvin Eberly (1890-), ordained deacon in 1920 and silenced in 1950. Moses G. Horst (83) and Abram Good (67) are still serving in the Maple Hill Wisler Mennonite congregation. On June 30, 1958, the congregation ordained Paul Horst (20) as preacher, and Milo Ressler (59) as deacon. The congregation has 25 members. The Guilford meetinghouse was sold to a near-by farmer after a conjoint meeting (1943) of the leaders of the (Wisler) Maple Hill congregation and

the (Ohio Conference) Bethel congregation. The money received was divided between the two congregations. In the spring of 1944 the farmer moved the old building to his farm and converted it into a poultry house. (The membership of the Bethel Mennonite congregation was 133 in 1958.)

35. Wisler Mennonites in Wayne County

(1) Wooster: In 1872 the patriarchal leader of the Mennonites of Chester Township in Wayne County was Bishop John Shaum (1797-1882). Born in Northampton County, Pennsylvania, September 25, 1797, he married Sarah Buzzard (1798-1878) on October 19, 1817. They lived in holy matrimony sixty-one years, and were the parents of sixteen children, including John F. Funk's colleague, Bishop Henry Shaum of Indiana, Jacob Wisler's successor, Bishop Christian Shaum, and Jacob Shaum, the donor of the land for the Shaum (Olive) Church in Elkhart County. John and Sarah Shaum moved to Wayne County, Ohio, in 1830 where he was almost immediately ordained preacher; he became a bishop about 1864. Eventually he cast his lot with Jacob Wisler. When he died on December 8, 1882, he was buried in the cemetery of the Chester Mennonite Church located at the center of Chester Township, Wayne County, northwest of Wooster. The ministerial colleagues of Bishop Shaum, as well as the entire congregation, followed him into the Wisler fellowship. The other three preachers were Peter Troxel, Peter Y. Landis, and Peter Imhoff. The schism was soon followed by the decision to erect a new meetinghouse (1873). The following were ordained after the schism: Michael Shaum (1842-1917) as deacon in 1892 and Daniel Martin (1856-1945) as preacher in 1898. In the schism of 1907 Imhoff, Shaum, and Martin all followed John W. Martin of Indiana into his Old Order group. In 1911 Jacob Burkhart (1866-1952) was ordained preacher in the Old Order group; the next year he became bishop. His Old Order group continually grew weaker numerically. By 1958 there were only four laymembers remaining, served by William H. Brubacher (1892-), who had been ordained as preacher in 1940. In 1939 Preacher Daniel Martin (1856-1945) left this Old Order group, which calls itself the Eightsquare Mennonite Church after the near-by Eightsquare schoolhouse, and united with the Wisler congregation, the Chester Mennonite Church. The Chester congregation is served by Amos Martin (1887-), ordained deacon in 1934, and Carl J. Good (1909-), ordained preacher in 1944, and bishop in 1952. The Old Order or "Burkhart" members ordinarily worship with the Chester congrega-

tion three Sundays per month and listen to Carl J. Good, but once a month William H. Brubacher leads the service of his four members and the Wisler members who attend. All services of both groups are held in the same Chester meetinghouse. In 1958 Good's Chester congregation had 49 members.

(2) Orrville: The other Wisler congregation in Wayne County was the one located east of Orrville in Baughman Township. This congregation used two meetinghouses. The Chestnut Ridge meetinghouse is in the east center of Section 32, one-half mile south of the southern edge of Orrville and two miles east. The County Line meetinghouse is in the east center part of Section 36 of Baughman Township, along the Stark County line. The Mennonites who followed Wisler in 1872 from the Pleasant View congregation of the Ohio Conference alternated with the Conference group until 1891, when they built the County Line Wisler meetinghouse. The Mennonites from the Martin's meetinghouse of the Ohio Conference who followed Wisler in 1872 also alternated with their former fellow members in the use of the Martin's meetinghouse until 1908 when they built the Chestnut Ridge meetinghouse; it was renovated in 1939. The two meetinghouses accommodated the Orrville congregation of Wisler Mennonites. The strong leader of this Wisler congregation was Henry Hursh (1839-1916), ordained preacher in 1873 and bishop in 1878, the year of Bishop Abraham Rohrer's death. Additional ordinations were as follows: David B. Horst (1833-1914) as deacon about 1877; Jacob Burkhart (1866-1952) as deacon in 1904;[9] Daniel Brubaker (1873-) as preacher in 1905;[10] Ezra H. Horst (1864-1931) as deacon in 1907; Benjamin Good (1875-1946) as preacher on September 22, 1907; David W. Wenger (1884-1947) as preacher on September 5, 1916; Harry A. Landis (1894-) as deacon June 14, 1931; Elmer Good (1916-) as preacher in 1946; Cleophas Steiner (1917-) as preacher in 1948; and Willis Good (1908.) as deacon November 20, 1954. Preacher Jacob Neuenschwander (1893-) of the Sonnenberg Swiss Mennonite congregation transferred his membership to the Orrville Wisler congregation in 1954.

Various factors led to a degree of tension in this congregation soon after 1950. Sentiments were divided over a case of marital difficulty in the Medina County congregation. Perhaps partly as a result of the revival meetings held in the area by George R. Brunk,

9 Burkhart transferred to the Chester Old Order congregation in 1908.

10 Brubaker followed John W. Martin in his Old Order schism in 1907. In 1958 he had but two members in addition to himself. All the Orrville ministers who were ordained since 1907 have adhered to the Wisler (progressive) group. The only ordained men to follow Martin were Jacob Burkhart and Daniel Brubaker.

Jr., and Lawrence Brunk, some of the members became dissatisfied with not having Sunday schools, and over other matters. In any case Deacon Harry A. Landis (59), and about forty laymembers withdrew from the Wisler Conference, and in 1953 affiliated with the Virginia Conference. Conference placed the new congregation, called Chestnut Ridge, under the bishop care of Louis Amstutz of the Sonnenberg congregation, Apple Creek, Wayne County, Ohio. The preacher for the new congregation is a young man (born 1932) from the Franconia Conference named Frank E. Nice, ordained in 1955. By agreement with the Wisler congregation, the new congregation was given the Chestnut Ridge meetinghouse, and the Wisler group retained the County Line meetinghouse. In 1958 the Orrville Wisler congregation had 160 members, and was served by preachers Elmer Good, Cleophas Steiner, and Jacob Neuenschwander, and by deacon Willis Good.

36. Wisler Mennonites in Mahoning County

The Ohio Conference Mennonites from which the Wisler group seceded in 1872 had three houses of worship in the Columbiana-Mahoning County area (the part of Mahoning County involved was a part of Columbiana County until 1846). These three meetinghouses were Oberholtzer's (now Midway), Metzler's (now North Lima), and Nold's (now Leetonia), all within a seven-mile radius. For the first twenty-five years after the Wisler division the seceding group worshiped in all of these three meetinghouses of the Ohio Conference Mennonites when they were not using it. In 1897, however, the Wisler congregation built the Pleasant View meetinghouse; it is located in Mahoning County west of the Midway meetinghouse. The membershep in 1897 is reported as having been forty. In 1958 it was 88. The Wisler ministers in 1872 at the time of the schism were Samuel Good (1810-1883), preacher, and David Weaver (1819-1890) and Christian Lehman (1832-1912), deacons. Sixteen families followed them into the new Wisler congregation in 1872. Jacob Tyson (1850-1914) ordained preacher in 1880, later moved into the community from Wood County, Ohio. Jacob L. Weaver was ordained preacher in 1881. Abraham Brubaker (1835-1912), who had been ordained as a preacher in Ontario in 1875, joined the congregation in 1883. Samuel Good (1846-1929) was ordained deacon in 1895. This is the list of ordained men serving up to the division of 1907.

In the division of 1907 preachers Jacob Tyson (67), Jacob L. Weaver (61), and Abraham Brubaker (72) went with John W. Martin of Indiana into his Old Order group. Deacon Samuel Good

(61) followed Bishop Henry Hursh and remained in the Ohio and Indiana Wisler Conference. On May 31, 1908, Hursh ordained Harvey Horst (1874-) as preacher in the Wisler group in Mahoning County. He served as preacher there for twenty years. In 1928 he moved to Virginia and transferred to the Old Order group there. In 1947 he removed to Elkhart County, Indiana, where he was living in 1958 at the age of 84. Menno Brubacher (1861-1939) was ordained deacon in 1912 in the Old Order group of Mahoning County, the last of their ordinations there. All the Old Order members have died or moved away. Five ordinations have been performed in the Pleasant View Wisler Mennonite congregation in the last fifty years: Daniel C. Witmer (1870-), ordained preacher on June 20, 1916; John J. Witmer (1867-1952), ordained deacon also on June 20, 1916; Israel Snyder (189 -), ordained preacher June 13, 1932; Henry W. Riehl (1898-), ordained deacon on November 12, 1944; and David A. Weaver (1923-), ordained preacher on October 11, 1948.

37. Wisler Mennonites in Emmet County, Michigan

The first Mennonite families to locate at Brutus in Emmet County came in 1879 from Ontario, the families of Preacher Abraham W. Detweiler (1828-1912) (who did not come directly from Ontario, however, but from Kent County, Michigan) and Jonas Brubacher. Joseph Detweiler and family came in 1880; Jacob Sauder in 1881; John Kilmer in 1882 from Indiana; and Christian Detweiler in 1882 from Kent County, Michigan. These families were members of the Mennonite Church. The meetinghouse (frame) was built in 1883. In 1886, perhaps influenced by the troubles in the Ontario Conference, the church divided. Bishop Jacob Wisler seems to have ordained Jonathan Gehman (1856-1893) to the ministry as early as 1886; and Detweiler and Gehman served the Wisler congregation which was created in 1886. For many years it was far stronger numerically than was the congregation which remained with Funk and the Indiana Conference.

Deacon Joel Snider (1874-1898), ordained in 1886, soon moved to Elkhart County, Indiana, and was succeeded by Joseph K. Detweiler (1860-1940), ordained about 1890 but soon silenced. Owen Snider (1854-1917) was ordained as preacher in 1896, several years after the death of Gehman, but about 1904 he became mentally ill. An Ontario young man, Daniel G. Brubacher (1870-), was ordained as preacher at Brutus on December 7, 1901, and as bishop on September 4, 1911; both ordinations were performed by John W. Martin of Indiana. Henry Brenneman (1863-1943) was ordained

preacher in 1907. The Wisler congregation at Brutus (which alternated in the use of the meetinghouse with the Indiana Conference group of Mennonites) followed Martin in the schism from the Wisler group in 1907. The Mennonite Conference group at Brutus grew weaker and smaller until by 1919 only three members were left. The next year the Indiana-Michigan Mennonite Mission Board placed Clyde X. Kauffman as preacher at Brutus. Immediately Wisler Old Order members began to transfer over to the Conference congregation, others moved away, and internal dissension continued the decline of the congregation. Deacon Jonas Brubacher (1843-1915) moved to Alberta where he died. David B. Horst (1873-), ordained as deacon on September 4, 1911, resigned in 1917, and moved first to Florida and then to Kitchener, where he was living in 1958. Christian Leinbach (1878-1946) was ordained as deacon in 1918 to succeed Horst, but was silenced about 1926. He then moved to Pennsylvania, where he died. Leinbach's successor was Henry G. Martin (1874-1944), who moved to Pennsylvania in 1939. He was ordained October 17, 1927. Bishop Brubacher, who was sixty-eight years old on December 2, 1938, still held a few services at Brutus during that year and the next, but that was the end. (Twenty years later, in 1959 there was only one member left.) In 1939 Bishop Brubacher moved back to Ontario, and in 1950 he with his wife moved to near Elverson, Pennsylvania, to live with their son Paul. In 1958 he was 88 and his wife, Anna (Eby), was 87.

38. Mennonites in Tuscola County, Michigan

A small settlement of Ontario Mennonites was made in Tuscola County, east of Saginaw, about 1880. Among the settlers were Preacher Daniel Lehman (1834-1919), who lived at Fairgrove (about thirty miles southwest of Pigeon), Noah Bechtel, Israel Detweiler, and Abram Lehman. Most of the settlers later moved elsewhere, but Preacher Lehman remained at Fairgrove all his life. At the time of their settlements in Tuscola County these Mennonites were undoubtedly from congregations affiliated with the Mennonite Conference of Ontario, but Lehman probably sympathized more with Wisler and the Woolwich Township Old Order Mennonites of Ontario than with the main body of Mennonites, which adopted Sunday schools, evening meetings, evangelistic meetings, and the like. It is doubtful if he ever actively affiliated with any group. Tuscola is listed in L. J. Burkholder's *Brief History of the Mennonites in Ontario* (1935) as a place where preaching services were held sometime during the history of the Ontario Mennonites. Burkholder gives

Lehman's date of ordination as September 22, 1861, in the Hay congregation. At the funeral of Preacher Lehman in 1919 the sermon was delivered in the Presbyterian Church by Peter Ropp of Imlay City, Michigan. Lehman's obituary was printed in the *Gospel Herald* of November 13, 1919.

39. Summary

The Mennonites of the major Mennonite body, represented by John F. Funk have prospered in the midwest. Indiana, Michigan, and Ohio had in 1958 a combined membership (Mennonite Church only, not all Mennonite bodies) of 17,500 baptized members. The Wisler Mennonites (the more progressive body which since 1907 is continuous with the 1872 Wisler Conference) in 1958 had a membership in Elkhart County, Indiana, of 200; in Wayne County, Ohio, 210; in Mahoning County, Ohio, 90; and in Medina County, Ohio, 25: a total of 525 members. This is the group which permitted the telephone in 1907, and which now permits the ownership and use of automobiles. (Formerly the members were required to paint the chrome bumpers black; this practice is disappearing, especially in Ohio.) The more conservative group of the 1907 schism had (1958) eight members in Wayne County, 100 members in Elkhart County, and one in Michigan. This group still uses horse-drawn conveyances, conducts its services mostly in the German language.

Historically, the Wisler Mennonites, in the era when they built most of their meetinghouses, attempted to keep the church architecture as much as possible in the older form. This meant, for example, that the pulpit bench and "desk" were not elevated above the level of the main auditorium at all; on the contrary, the floor was progressively elevated toward the back of the room. When Bishop Jacob Wisler visted his old home congregation (Midway) in Columbiana County, Ohio (where he had been ordained preacher in 1833), after the new Midway meetinghouse of 1869 had been built, he refused to preach from behind the pulpit because it was higher than the people. Samuel D. Culp (born 1860) says that he remembers the remark made by Wisler as he stood down on a level with the audience: "Epp ich dat d'ruff daet geh', daet ich liever in e' diefer Loch neisteh' " (Before I would go up there, I'd rather descend into a deeper hole." It is also reported that when the two groups (Wisler and Funk) began to talk about the building of a new Shaum (Olive) meetinghouse, ten or fifteen years after the 1872 schism, one of the points of disagreement was whether to elevate the rear of the auditorium or the pulpit. (The pulpit was elevated, and the Wisler group discontinued the use of the meetinghouse.)

40. The Wisler Conference Rules (Progressive Group) of 1931

Neither the Wisler nor the Old Order group prints or distributes its rules and discipline. Both groups, of course, have ministerial conferences where the disciplinary standards are agreed upon. On at least one occasion, however, the rules and discipline of the Wisler Conference were typed for the use of the ministers (but not for distribution to the members). Through the kindness of one of the Wisler leaders, this copy has been made available. Needless to say, this is a dated document. Certain of these decisions are no longer in force, e.g., the rule permitting touring cars but not sedans. The text of the document follows:

RULES AND DISCIPLINE OF THE INDIANA AND OHIO CONFERENCE HELD IN MEDINA COUNTY, OHIO

October 9, 1931

The following was again adopted at this Conference:

1. The nonresistant doctrine shall in all things be strictly followed and carried out, not only on pertaining to taking the sword, using the law, etc., but in all our walk and conduct in life.

2. It is necessary that the Bishops, Ministers, and Deacons become acquainted with each other, and that they consider, assert, and continue the Evangelical Rules and Discipline of the Church advocated by our forefathers.

3. *Order of Calling and Ordaining the Ministry:* Our Saviour after being baptized of John and tempted of Satan chose twelve apostles. Afterwards He chose seventy others and sent them to preach the Gospel. After His resurrection from the dead and before His ascension into heaven He again gave His eleven apostles charge to preach the Gospel and to baptize the believers in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Matt. 28:19. After the vacancy occurred by the transgression of Judas Iscariot, it was again filled by taking votes and casting lots, and called by the Holy Ghost. Acts 20:28. The ministry shall not be paid for their labors. Matt. 10:8; I Peter 5:2. The apostles commanded that the church shall always be provided with Bishops, Ministers, and Deacons to preach the Gospel and to provide for the poor. I Tim. 3; Acts 6:1-6.

4. *The Duties of the Ministry.* It is the duty of the Bishop to vist the sick, instruct and baptize the penitent believers, and to receive such into the church, with the counsel of the church; to hold communion and feet-washing with them; to excommunicate the disobedient, with the counsel of the church. It is the duty of the Minister to visit the sick, to preach the Word of God, to warn sinners, to comfort the penitent, and to point them to the faith of Jesus. A minister shall not baptize except in case of sickness, when the services of the bishop cannot be secured at the time. It is the duty of the Deacon to distribute to the poor members of the church, to testify to the Word preached, to read the text for the minister in charge. In case no minister is present in the meeting, then the deacon shall read a portion of Scripture, and pray with the congregation. When enmity arises in the church, the deacon shall look after it.

5. We can perceive that when questions or differences arose the apostles came together to counsel, and gave decision how to be governed.

6. The Church consists of penitent, believing, and obedient members.

7. *Order of Receiving Believers into the Church:* They shall be examined if they are in peace, penitent and believing, and are willing to submit wholly to the evangelical, nonresistant doctrine of the Gospel, and to the rules of the church, wherein they shall be fully and instructed before baptism, and shall be received into the church with the counsel of the church.

8. The church shall be examined before communion, to learn if the members are in peace, at which examination it is customary to preach on the eighteenth chapter of Mathew.

9. A day of prayer and fasting should be observed before communion.

10. Feet-washing is observed immediately after communion. John 13.

11. When grievances or differences arise between members, the grieved member shall observe Matthew 18. No bishop, minister, or deacon shall receive a complaint before the brotherly address according to Matthew 18:13-18 has been complied with.

12. Swearing of oaths is forbidden. We shall affirm to our testimony. Our communication shall be Yea, yea; nay, nay. Matthew 5. According to the nonresistant doctrine of the Gospel it is not allowed to take the sword, neither to sue at the law.

13. *Worldly offices:* The brethren are not allowed to serve in any office except school director and road supervisor, and these are earnestly testified against.

14. *Voting:* This is testified against. However, if a brother feels it his duty he may quietly go and cast his ballot and immediately return home again. It is considered best that the bishops, ministers, and deacons shall not go to the polls to vote.

15. *Matrimony:* We acknowledge a Christian matrimony between one man and one woman who are believers and lead a nonresistant life. If a member marries one out of the church, that member shall be put back from counsel of brethren and communion until he acknowledges and openly confesses that he has transgressed the evangelical discipline of the church. After such confession he may again be received into the church by the bishop.

16. *Pride:* Whatsoever is highly esteemed among men is abomination before God. Jesus says: "Learn of me, for I am meek and lowly in heart." Therefore we earnestly testify against pride and haughtiness in every respect. Homes should be kept plain, funerals should be conducted in a plain and quiet way, also all that we possess, that we may be as lights in the midst of a crooked and perverse nation.

17. *Musical Instruments:* These together with radios are strictly forbidden.

18. Secret societies, life insurance, etc., are strictly forbidden; also taking of photos.

19. Lightning rods are forbidden and the insuring of buildings is testified against.

20. *Serving as Juror:* In criminal cases it is forbidden, but is allowed in other cases. It is however, advisable that the brethren shall avoid it when possible.

21. *Automobiles:* Plain black touring cars, roadsters, and trucks are allowed. It is believed that greater uniformity and separation can be maintained in this way.

22. Dealing in livestock, buying and selling for gain, is testified against.

23. Holding membership in worldly organizations, clubs, or unions, is forbidden.

24. Attending theaters and other places of amusement is contrary to Bible teaching, hence it is forbidden.

25. When enmity or strife occurs in one bishop's district, no bishop, minister, or deacon shall meddle therewith unless called by said bishop. In case, however, if a bishop should teach wrong doctrines, contrary to the nonresistant faith, or lead the congregation astray, the congregation may appeal to Conference.

26. When a member absents himself or herself from communion, and does not support the church, then such member shall be visited and examined. If he is unable to attend to his duties as a member he shall be borne in patience and love. But if he can and will not, then he shall be visited several times and admonished, and if he still refuses, and does not ask for patience, then he shall be given over to the church.

It is nothing short of a tragedy that the Wisler division occurred. The fear of Preacher David Shirk in 1868 that an Elkhart County division might involve the entire American Mennonite Church was in some sense realized, for the 1872 division in Indiana and Ohio, was followed by a similar division in Ontario in 1889, by one in the Lancaster Conference of Eastern Pennsylvania in 1893, and by another in Rockingham County, Virginia, in 1901. The loss of the conservative wing of the brotherhood in the years 1872 to 1901 hastened the cultural accommodation of the larger body, the Mennonite Church, by depriving it of the needed checks on a too rapid cultural change. On the other hand, the present writer is inclined to fear that such an excessive preoccupation with the endeavor not to permit change as obtains in the more conservative factions of the Old Order Mennonites does not lead to true spirituality nor to unity in the church. Looking back over the history of the Wisler schism one's heart must bleed for a man being expelled from his church for trying to maintain the doctrine and practice which he had known from his boyhood. If only Brenneman and Funk could have been more patient with Wisler it is possible that the unity of the church could have been maintained. And it is certain that the newer agencies for which they contended would ultimately have come anyhow. The most indefensible—if not rash—act of Funk was the expulsion of Jacob Wisler on Saturday, January 6, 1872. The fact that Daniel Brenneman was expelled in 1874, and that Funk had to be relieved of his bishop oversight in 1902, would indicate that Wisler was probably not the only leader at fault in the sad years of 1866-1872.

ATTENDANCE IN MENNONITE COLLEGES, 1957-58

Silas Hertzler

For the school year 1957-58, reports are herewith tabulated for eighteen Mennonite colleges and professional schools. Several years ago when the Mennonite Brethren in Christ group changed its name to the United Missionary Church the Mountain View Bible College located at Didsbury, Alberta, requested that data for their college should no longer be given in this study. Beginning with the present statistics, Bethel College, Mishawaka, Indiana, also is not included. However, even with the loss of their attendance of 366, the increase for 1957-58 over 1956-57 was seven students. One other statement of significance is that the Mennonite School of Nursing at La Junta, Colorado, has ceased to function as a training school for nurses, though the hospital is still very much alive. The report from that school ends with the report of the eleven who graduated in 1958.

The names and addresses of the eighteen schools included in this report are as follows:

Mennonite Biblical Seminary, 4614 Woodlawn Avenue, Chicago 15, Illinois.

Mennonite Brethren Biblical Seminary, 4824 East Butler Avenue, Fresno, California.

Goshen College, Goshen, Indiana

Bethel College, North Newton, Kansas

Eastern Mennonite College, Harrisonburg, Virginia

Bluffton College, Bluffton, Ohio

Tabor College, Hillsboro, Kansas

Grace Bible Institute, 1515 South Tenth Street, Omaha 8, Nebraska

Mennonite Brethren Bible College, 77 Kelvin Street, Winnipeg 5, Manitoba

Hesston College, Hesston, Kansas

Canadian Mennonite Bible College, 600 University Boulevard East, Tuxedo, Winnipeg 9, Manitoba

Freeman Junior College, Freeman, South Dakota

Pacific Bible Institute, 2149 Tuolumne Street, Fresno 21, California

Mennonite Collegiate Institute, Box 39, Gretna, Manitoba

Bethel Deaconess Hospital School of Nursing, 411 South East Second Street, Newton, Kansas

Mennonite Hospital School of Nursing, Bloomington, Illinois

Mennonite Educational Institute, Box 127, Clearbrook, British Columbia

La Junta Mennonite School of Nursing, La Junta, Colorado

Except for the graduate seminaries, the five interpretative tables are arranged so as to list the largest colleges first. Table I gives totals, with separate columns for graduate students and for college students, as well as for men and for women. There was a considerable increase in the number of graduate students, though 50 of the 185 were liberal arts students, many presumably merely taking further courses for teacher certification, or for some similar purpose, and were not working toward a graduate degree. The greatest increase in attendance was at Bluffton College with an added enrollment of 81. Allowing for the fact that no report was included for 1957-58 from one college with an enrollment of 366 students the previous year, there was a net increase for 1957-58 of 373 students. Table II lists students by classes. On this point there are no significant changes over the previous year.

Table III indicates a slight increase in the proportion of Mennonite students. The proportion was 74.89 per cent as compared with 73.35 per cent the previous year. Table IV, on summer attendance, shows considerable variation from year to year. The attendance was smaller in 1957 than in 1956.

Diplomas and degrees granted are listed in Table V. The graduate degrees offered are the B.D., the M.R.E., and the M.A. degrees, with the Th.B. as a sort of hybrid, sometimes representing graduate work, and sometimes a Bible major for four years of college work. This time only fourteen different bachelor's degrees were granted as compared with eighteen the year before. A total of 709 degrees and diplomas were given by sixteen of the eighteen colleges included in the study.

TABLE I

Total Enrollment in Mennonite Colleges, 1957-58

School	Graduate Students	College	Special Students	Not of College Grade	Total Enrollment	Men	Women
M.B.S.	44	5	—	—	49	31	18
M.B.B.S.	22	—	5	—	27	25	2
Goshen	71[1]	1063	—	19[2]	1153	512	641
Bethel	—	718	—	78[3]	796	390	406
E.M.C.	14[4]	478	87[5]	—	579	279	300
Bluffton	—	425	—	66[3]	491	234	257
Tabor	31[7]	270	—	48[3]	349	158	191
Grace	—	271	—	—	271	126	145
M.B.B.C.	3	115	105[6]	—	223	101	122
Hesston	—	154	—	—	154	65	89
Canadian	—	119	—	27	146	71	75
Freeman	—	121	—	—	121	45	76
Pacific	—	84	—	—	84	51	33
M.C.I.	—	67	—	—	67	38	29
Bethel Hospital	—	64	—	—	64	—	64
Bloomington	—	49	—	—	49	—	49
M.E.I.	—	26	—	—	26	17	9
La Junta	—	11	—	—	11	—	11
Total	185	4040	197	238	4660	2143	2517

[1] 65 seminary students; 6 liberal arts
[2] correspondence students
[3] music and art students
[4] 7 seminary students; 7 liberal arts
[5] 27 extension students; 33 adult education; 27 correspondence
[6] Extension and evening students
[7] Liberal arts graduate students

TABLE II

Enrollment by Classes, 1957-58

School	Graduate Students	Seniors	Juniors	Soph.	Fresh.	Spe.	Summer	Not of College Grade	Total
M.B.S.	44	—	—	—	—	5[1]	—	—	49
M.B.B.S.	22	—	—	—	—	5[2]	—	—	27
Goshen	71[12]	128	124	189	253	272[13]	97[14]	19	1153
Bethel	—	118	101	124	193	135[3]	47	78	796
E.M.C.	14	51	67	105	170	130[4]	42	—	579
Bluffton	—	69	61	77	110	46[5]	62	66	491
Tabor	31	35	37	62	93	32	11	48	349
Grace	—	46	46	39	95	45[6]	—	—	271
M.,B.B.C.	3	—	22	30	63	105[7]	—	—	223
Hesston	—	1	—	43	96	14	—	—	154
Canadian	—	9	1	27	56	26[8]	—	27	146
Freeman	—	—	—	21	44	40[9]	16	—	121
Pacific	—	6	10	12	38	18[10]	—	—	84
M.C.I.	—	—	—	—	67	—	—	—	67
Bethel Hospital	—	—	21	22	21	—	—	—	64
Bloomington	—	—	18	19	12	—	—	—	49
M.E.I.	—	—	—	—	26[11]	—	—	—	26
La Junta	—	—	11	—	—	—	—	—	11
Total	185	463	519	770	1337	873	275	238	4660

[1] 1 college junior; 4 part time
[2] unclassified
[3] 63 part time; 72 evening and extension students
[4] 43 part time; 27 evening students; 33 adult education; 27 correspondence
[5] 38 part time; 8 in evening classes
[6] 14 part time; 13 evening students
[7] 7 part time; 98 evening students
[8] Extension and evening classes
[9] 9 part time; 31 evening students
[10] 8 part time; 10 evening students
[11] Grade XIII
[12] 13 part time special seminary students
[13] mostly evening and Saturday students
[14] 19 spring students; 78 summer students, exclusive of duplicates

TABLE III

Students by Denominations, 1957-58

School	Mennonites Men	Mennonites Women	Mennonites Total	Non-Mennonites Men	Non-Mennonites Women	Non-Mennonites Total	Grand Total
M.B.S.	31	17	48	—	1	1	49
M.B.B.S.	16	2	18	9	—	9	27
Goshen	418	461	879	94	180	274	1153
Bethel	285	284	569	99	128	227	796
E.M.C.	265	292	557	14	8	22	579
Bluffton	110	115	225	124	142	266	491
Tabor	137	161	298	21	30	51	349
Grace	65	84	149	61	61	122	271
M.B.B.C.	99	121	220	2	1	3	223
Hesston	62	87	149	3	2	5	154
Canadian	70	72	142	1	3	4	146
Freeman	34	51	85	11	25	36	121
Pacific	30	23	53	21	10	31	84
M.C.I.	36	29	65	2	—	2	67
Bethel Hospital	—	49	49	—	15	15	64
Bloomington	—	10	10	—	39	39	49
M.E.I.	17	9	26	—	—	—	26
La Junta	—	10	10	—	1	1	11
Total	1675	1877	3552	462	646	1108	4660

TABLE IV

Students in Summer Session, 1957

School	Men	Women	Total
Goshen	79	221	300
Bethel	61	81	142
Bluffton	41	92	133
E.M.C.	23	47	70
Bethel Hospital	—	64	64
Tabor	25	25	50
Bloomington	—	49	49
La Junta	—	11	11
Total	229	590	819

TABLE V

Degrees Granted and Diplomas Given, 1957

	M.B.B.S.	M.B.S.	Goshen	Bethel	Bluffton	E.M.C.	Tabor	Grace	M.B.B.C.	Canadian	Pacific	Hesston	Bethel Hosp.	Bloomington	Freeman	La Junta	Total
B.D.	2	3	6	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	11
M.R.E.	—	2	4	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	6
M.A.	4	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	4
Th.B.	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	—	7	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	8
B.A.	—	—	68	33	14	14	31	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	160
B.S. in Ed.	—	—	64	1	26	10	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	101
B.S.	—	—	—	47	29	6	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	82
B.A. in Bible	—	—	—	—	—	9	—	25	—	—	6	—	—	—	—	—	40
B.S. in Nurs.	—	—	22	6	—	5	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	34
B.S. in El. Ed.	—	—	—	18	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	18
B. of Chr. Ed.	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	8	9	—	—	—	—	—	—	17
B.R.E.	—	—	3	—	—	1	—	4	—	—	—	1	—	—	—	—	9
B.S. in Ho. Ec.	—	—	—	6	—	3	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	9
B.S. in Ind. Arts	—	—	—	7	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	7
B.S. in Biol.	—	—	—	3	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	3
B.S. in Bus.	—	—	—	3	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	3
B.S. Nat. Sci.	—	—	—	2	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	2
B. Sac. Mus.	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1
Nurs. Diploma	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	22	15	—	11	48
3 year Bible	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	15	3	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	18
Mus. Diploma	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	3	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	4
A.A.	—	—	15	11	—	—	—	—	—	—	3	36	—	—	10	—	75
A.A. in Bus.	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	3	—	—	—	—	3
Jr. College	—	—	—	—	—	9	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	9
2 yr. Normal	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	9	—	9
Jr. Col. Bible	—	—	—	—	—	5	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	5
2 yr. Bible	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	1
Secretarial	—	—	13	—	—	3	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	16
1 yr. Normal	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	5	—	5
Am. Studies	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1
Total	6	5	195	137	69	67	31	46	21	9	11	40	22	15	24	11	709

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL AND RESEARCH NOTES

I WAS A STRANGER

In the Andreas Decker family history published in 1959, we find this notation: "Two of the boys, Benjamin and Tobias (Jantz) went to Elkhart, Indiana, to earn some money, but remained to live, married and reared families there." According to the record, Benjamin Jantz married Elizabeth Kerr and Tobias Jantz married Lovina Smeltzer. In both cases, Jantz was changed to Yontz (or Johnson?).

Similar notations might be found in other family records indicating the fact that of the many Mennonites who came to America in the 1870's and found temporary shelter among the Mennonites east of the Mississippi, some found it so good that they stayed. There are, no doubt, many stories which could be recorded of how the Eastern Mennonites provided hospitality for the Mennonite immigrants from Russia enroute to their destinations in the plains states and provinces.

The problem of financing and providing for the Mennonite movement from Europe to the western states was of huge proportions, leading to the formation of the Mennonite Board of Guardians, December 2, 1873, and the Mennonite Executive Aid Society, April 14, 1874. Through the medium of the *Herald of Truth* and its German counterpart, *Herold der Wahrheit,* and the *Friedensbote,* the services of these committees were presented to the Mennonites and appeals were issued for the financial support of the migration movement. As editor of *Herald of Truth* and treasurer of the Board of Guardians, John F. Funk was in a very favorable position to publicize the need confronting the Board. Beginning early in 1874, financial appeals were issued in various periodicals and an accounting was made of monies received for the "Russian Relief Fund." It soon became apparent that this financial aid would not be sufficient to provide for transportation of the needy families and groups and help them establish themselves in America.

Thus, in February 1874 John F. Funk published an appeal in the *Herald of Truth* with this heading: "Another Way to Aid Our Russian Brethren."[1] In this article Funk writes, "A brother from Ohio proposes to give a liberal sum to the Aid Fund on conditons that the parties who receive this aid shall stay with him and work out the amount for him on his farm. He also thinks others in his neighborhood would give liberally to the cause if they could in this way obtain persons who would work for them." If this plan were put into practice, it was the hope of Funk that the immigrants would not only be able to earn the amount of the passage and a little to spare, but also become acquainted with the American methods of labor and thus be prepared to go west and take a homestead. The destitute immigrants would not have to be settled on the bare prairie where they might be in danger of suffering for the necessities of life.

The response to this plan was immediate and wholehearted. In the next issue of the *Herald of Truth,* David Basinger and Abraham Steiner write as follows: "At this place (Bluffton, Ohio) there is but a small church of sixty-five members, and we bind ourselves to care for and give employment to seven families, be they large or small. Labor can also be had among us for single men and women. We perfectly agree with the brother from Ohio who presented such an excellent plan in the February number of the *Herald.*" The letter then gives the sums that had been collected and includes the sum of $378 which is to be a loan or "as pay for labor."

The committees aiding the migration now became clearing houses for the placement of families and individuals who needed help on their way to the prairie states. The Executive Aid Committee in its second circular, of May 15, included among the reasons why it should be allowed to serve the cause of the migration, the following: "Should the Mennonites take advantage of this transportation offered, it is planned that a Mennonite rest home be established in these old settlements to serve for a temporary reception of the ill and infirm, for those seeking work and without means, and at low rates for others."

The pattern of providing hospitality and work for the immigrants had by this time become quite well established. The files of the Mennonite Board of Guardians in the Bethel College Historical Library contain many references to the placement of individuals and families in various communities and homes east of the Mississippi River. Under the date of March 23, 1874, Bishop Jonas J. Kauffman of Chesterville, Douglas County, Illinois, advises David Goerz that the congregation has available for the Russian brethren a gift of $62.50 and for the support of laborers and maids the sum of $350. The letters adds: "We would like to have three young men and two maidens to work and we will also try to help two families."

One of the signatories of the above letter, Daniel Schrock, writes in a letter of April 7 that they want to know when these two families will come, how many persons will be in the families, and whether or not they will speak German. Apparently there were some rumors that the Russian Mennonites did not speak German.

As business agent for the Board of Guardians, it was Bernhard Warkentin's task to meet the immigrants upon their arrival in New York and facilitate their westward movement. The fact that there were unscrupulous agents in New York ready to take advantage of the immigrants made this service extremely important. In July Warkentin was in New York and under date of the 20th he wrot to David Goerz, "I have persuaded Jacob Wiebe and his twenty-four families to go to Elkhart temporarily till they have found a place in Nebraska or elsewhere." Warkentin has also met the first contingent of the Alexanderwohl group. Of these he goes on to say that through Cornelius Janzen's influence, twenty-five families had been sent to Clarence Center [New York] where they would stay until the congregation had chosen its place of settlement. Two days later Warkentin writes that five families of the Kleine Gemeinde group have also been sent to Clarence Center.

Upon the arrival of the Swiss Volhynians, Warkentin sent seven families to D. Basinger, Bluffton, and the rest to John P. King, West Liberty, Ohio. He writes, "The two families with means will no doubt go direct to Yankton, Dakota Territory, where all of them really wanted to go—if I and Brother P. Stobbe had not seriously advised them that there was no place for destitute people there."

Apparently Bernhard Warkentin carried with him various requests from communities, congregations, and families which he tried to honor by sending indivduals and families to these places offering hospitality and work. On one sheet he made this notation: "Lists of names and addresses and how many destitute Mennonites may be directed to them upon their arrival in New York." The listing is an interesting one and perhaps people living in the areas mentioned would like to know who provided hospitality for whom. The following is this list in which Warkentin indicates by states the places where he might send Mennonite immigrants for work and hospitality.

Pennsylvania

1 man 18 or 20 years old to C. P. Livengood, Dale City, Somerset Co. Pa. stop at Pittsburg.
1 small family or couple of young married people, who should be willing to live together in a small house—one should be a good shoemaker and the other a laboring man.—Go from N.Y. through Trenton in N. Jersey, from there to Point Pleasant station on the Delaware and Baltimore R. R. to Samuel Nash, Wismer, Bucks Co. Pa.
1 young man 18-20 years old, for farming work to be sent to David J. Zook (Zug) Allenville, Mifflin Co. Pa.—go to Harrisburg, Pa. from there to Mill Creek Station in Hundingdon Co. Pa. from Mill-Creek to Allenville. Seven Miles in Kishacoquillas Valley.

Ohio

1 young man on the farm for one year to Christian C. Naffzinger, Archbold, Ohio, Fulton County.
To John Augspurger sr. Trenton, Butler County, Ohio—he wants 5 or 6 women and several men to work.
2 young working men on the farm to Henry Schenk, Elida, Allen County, Ohio. Station on Pittsburg Fort Wayne and Chicago R.R. west of Lima, Ohio.

Illinois

3 families. John Birky, Fremont, Tazewell Co. Ill. The church is willing to give 1000 Doll. if the Russian brethren and young women would come and work for them.
1 young man from 18 to 25 years old to Seth Burkholder, Morrison Whiteside Co. Ills.—from Chicago to N. West, R. R. to Dixon, lives 25 miles west of Dixon near Morris Station.
Several Families to Joseph Gerber lives 5 miles north of Danvers, McLean Co. Ills, would be glad to have them come.
2 families to Daniel Schrock Chesterville, Douglass Co. Ills,—he want 2 women and 3 men to work—send if possible.
1 family to Benjamin Hartman, Washington, Tazewell Co. Ill. wants a boy about 10 years old, who has no parents.
one boy from 12 to 14 years old to Joseph Kornhaus, 5 miles north of Morrison Ills. direct him to Seth Burkholder, Morrison, Whiteside Co. Ills.

Indiana

Jacob Goldsmith, Linn Grove County, Ind. gives 400 dollars to earn it all off—lives south of Fort Wayne. 2 families.

Missouri

several families to Peter Lehman and Christian Wälty, Tipton, Moniteau County, Mo. on the Mo. and Pacific R. R.

Iowa

1 Family also a boy and girl not under 10 years old to Samuel Guengerich, Amish, Johnson Co., Iowa.
Several families with young unmarried people to work on the farm to J. J. Schwartzentruber, Amish, Johnson Co. Iowa.
2 families to Rev. Christian Schowalter, Franklin Centre, Lee Co. Iowa.
2 families to John F. Hirschler, on the same address as above.
2 families to Herman Krehbiel, Keota, Keokuk County, Iowa.

Occasionally mistakes were made as indicated by the fact that on August 9, 1874, John F. Funk wrote to David Goerz that Warkentin had sent two young men to Leetonia, Ohio, but since these men were not destitute, they did not wish to work in this community. Other problems involved those who were sick and became a burden upon their hosts. John Augspurger of Trenton, Ohio, thus writes to David Goerz that on September 5 two families of Russian brethren had arrived of whom two persons were very sick.

A brief tabulation of persons or places where immigrants temporarily found homes indicates the following: S. S. Swartzentruber of Amish, Johnson County, Iowa, says that his congregation will care for 10-12 destitute families. Joseph Gerber wired from Danvers, Illinois, that the congregation there would take from 10-12 families. John Burkey wired from Tremont, Illinois, that they would take eight families. John R. Yoder of Orrville, Ohio, writes that they will accommodate 15-20 families and may also be able to give them work. John F. Funk writes to David Goerz that Alm Mast of Benton, Holmes County, Ohio, asks for four families and indicates he would like a minister as one of them. Christian Schneck of Apple Creek writes that the Sonnenberg congregation will take twelve families. Later A. E. Funk writes that the above congregation will take two three more families. When one contingent of the Karolswalde group arrived, Warkentin sent eight families to Kansas, and the rest to Dakota.

These immigrants often found that they had lost contact with relatives and fellow immigrants and could only re-establish contact through the Board of Guardians. From McClean County, Illinois, Julius Kerber writes under date of December 26, 1874, that the Benjamin Unruh, Heinrich Block, and Heinrich Goertz families left for Kansas. Johan Ewert and Wilhelm Fast had also gone to Kansas. Among those still in the community were Kornelius Kliewer, Peter Schroeder, David Köhn,, Johan Baer Kornelius Goertz, and the Heinrich Goertz couple. Kerber adds, "We all thank God that we are still in good health and are satisfied that we have come to America and have been so hospitably received by our brethren."

While there seems to be no written agreement or contract relative to the operation of this program of giving shelter and aid before settling Mennonites on th prairies, this pattern was generally accepted and followed. If only one major instance does there seem to have been a failure to carry through the details of this program. This applied to the fate of the ninety families arriving on the steamship *Vaterland,* December 25, 1874, and transferring at once to St. Louis where Bernhard Warkentin met the group. From here they continued to Hutchinson, Kansas, where shelter had previously been promised. This was now denied and most of the immigrants were taken back to Florence, where they were sheltered in temporary housing until spring. It had been assumed by the Executive Aid Committee that it would be cheaper to provide for these people in Kansas. The Board of Guardians, on the other hand, felt that allowing this destitute group to come to Kansas constituted a breach of the agreement to keep all needy Mennonites in more populous Mennonite centers until they could be adequately taken care of in the West. This episode was regretted by all and threatened to inject tense feelings into a relationship that had become co-operative and cordial. It also indicated that the bulk of the immigrants did enjoy the hospitality of older Mennonite settlements from the Atlantic Coast to the Mississippi River. No doubt many warm friendships were formed through these relationships and many letters must have continued to pass between the newcomers and their

hosts who had helped them become adjusted to America and to gain a financial footing to enable their settlement on the barren prairies.

Bethel College JOHN F. SCHMIDT

AN EXPERIMENTAL EVALUATION OF THE OBJECTIVES OF A MENNONITE COLLEGE

Each educational institution should have clearly defined purposes. These objectives are "consciously willed goals," the ends which are desired by the school. At the basis of these goals lies the particular philosophy of education to which the school is committed.

The objectives are usually stated in the catalog of an institution and presumably guide the entire program of education as it is carried on in the school. Whether this is merely an assumption requires some type of evaluation. Tyler says:

> The process of evaluation begins with the objectives of the educational program. Since the purpose is to see how far these objectives are actually being realized, it is necessary to have evaluation procedures that will give evidence about each of the kinds of behavior implied by each of the major educational objectives.[1]

Objectives can be evaluated for two results: knowledge and actions. The evaluation may bring to light what students know or what they know they should be doing. It is quite another thing to find out whether they actually do what the college hopes they will do.

This study was an attempt to devise an instrument which would record student opinion concerning the implementation of the objectives of a Christian college. It became necessary to translate the objectives into "operational terms," or "life situations." The data thus gathered could then be evaluated and interpreted.

The underlying assumption of this study was that if the objectives of a Christian college actually come into the instructional phase of the college's program, it would follow that the longer a student has been at the college, the more he will recognize the efforts put forth by the college in the area of its objectives. A higher rating could be expected with each succeeding class.

The Procedure Followed

1. Teachers were asked to state four things the graduates and students of their college would be doing if the particular objective under consideration had been achieved. The college studied had eight objectives listed in the catalog. (Appendix I) The instructors were asked to treat all eight objectives in this manner.

2. The responses of the teachers were evaluated and classified by a faculty committee and each objective was restated in terms of four "life situations."

3. The thirty-two "life-situations" were printed in the form of a rating scale giving the students and graduates an opportunity to record

1 Ralph W. Tyler, *Basic Principles of Curriculum and Instruction.* (Chicago, 1950), 71 f.

the degree to which they thought their college had helped them to accomplish that particular life goal. The scale was given to the four classes enrolled at the college and the most recent class of graduates.

4. The responses were tabulated and a mean rating established for each class by assigning a numerical value to each category on the scale. This was done for each class on each of the thirty-two statements and for the class as a whole on the entire study.

5. The differences among the class responses were subjectde to statistical procedures to ascertain whether the difference was significant. The method used was the application of X^2 distribution in research problems involving more than 1 degree of freedom.[2]

6. Various observations were formulated and presented in the summary.

Collecting the Data

After an explanation to the faculty, the objectives of the school, as stated in the catalog, were distributed. The instructions requested each instructor to read the objectives carefully and then to write down four things which he hoped the students and graduates would do if the college had accomplished that particular objective. Of the twenty-six instructors, twenty-two co-operated. These submitted a total of 419 items. These were recorded and evaluated for their usefulness. Many items were discarded because they did not represent ideals which the instructor hoped would emerge in the student's life as a result of the student's school experience. Some items were suggestions as to the way in which these goals could be accomplished, as for instance, "continue Bible Conference Week" or "provide better books." Duplications among the items were many and had to be eliminated before they could be submitted for final consideration by a faculty committee.

Of the 419 items, 178 remained after duplications and inappropriate items had been deleted. A committee of five was appointed to study these items and to reduce them to thirty-two, four for each objective.

The selected items were printed with an attached rating scale (Appendix 2). A five point scale was used and the items pertaining to each objective were grouped together. The objective itself did not appear on the scale. The scale was supplied with instructions and given to a small group of students so that any obvious deficiencies could be corrected.

The scale was administered to the entire student body during one of the daily chapel periods. Instructions were given encouraging the students to record their feelings honestly. They were not required to sign their names. The scale was also sent to the mose recently graduated class with a letter of explanation attached.

Faculty members were then asked to record their rating of the total efforts of the school on these thirty-two items. In other words, they were asked to say how well they *thought* the school was accomplishing these things in the lives of the students.

The results were recorded in a way which showed how many subjects had checked each of the five categories on the scale. The responses of each class on each objective were analyzed and the mean established. The following class means were obtained for each objective.

2 Allen L. Edwards, *Experimental Design in Psychological Research* (New York, 1950), Chapter 6.

TABLE I

COMPARISON OF MEANS BY CLASSES

Objective	Fresh. N.76	Soph. N.50	Jun. N.20	Sen. N.21	Grad. N. 21	Fac. N.22
I	2.80	3.05	3.46	3.38	3.84	3.53
II	2.81	2.88	3.28	3.39	3.94	3.60
III	3.22	3.91	3.81	3.73	4.08	3.45
IV	3.28	3.59	3.86	3.83	4.13	3.41
V	2.90	3.50	3.03	3.24	3.95	3.09
VI	3.21	3.31	3.75	3.79	3.92	3.48
VII	2.92	3.20	3.20	3.57	3.52	3.28
VIII	3.17	3.13	3.36	3.37	3.69	3.33
Total	3.04	3.20	3.46	3.54	3.88	3.40

Interpreting the Findings

A. *Comparison of Classes*—The findings reveal that the hypothesis underlying this study was verified in that each successive year at the college produced a higher mean on the rating scale. From the total response to the eight objectives the mean for each class was:

Freshman	3.04
Sophomore	3.20
Junior	3.46
Senior	3.54
Graduates	3.88

When the total responses of the classes on all eight objectives were compared with each other, it was found that the difference was statistically significant at a level of probability less than one per cent with the exception of the junior-senior responses where the level of probability was 15 per cent. In other words, the chances were less than one in one hundred that such a difference in responses between the classes could have happened by chance alone.

B. *Ranking the Objectives*—The students, as a group, ranked Objective IV in first place. This objective aimed "to develop general competence in discovering and evaluating facts, theories, and philosophies in the basic areas of human knowledge." The students ranked Objective II in the lowest position, whereas the faculty ranked Objective II in the first position. This objective deals with the teachings and practices of the Mennonite church which supports the college. The ranking by the faculty agreed more with that of the upper level students than with that of the first two classes in the college.

Conclusion

1. The study shows that when the objectives of this college are translated into operational terms and rated by the students, the results point to the conclusion that in the opinion of students, the school is accomplishing its purposes.

2. The study reveals that the students think that of the eight objectives, the second objective, that the instructing the students in the history and practices of their church, receives least emphasis in the program of the college. Peculiarly enough, the faculty thinks that the school does its best work in this area.

3. The study shows that according to faculty responses the school does its poorest work in the area set forth by objective five, which deals with the matter of responsible citzenship.

4. The study shows that when student and graduate responses are treated as a group, objectives four receives the highest rating. This would seem to speak favorably for the academic program of the school.

APPENDIX I

The Objectives of Tabor College

1. To impart knowledge of the background, faith, and ideals of Christianity to all its students and to encourage consistent application of those ideals in daily living with the conviction that every vocation should be regarded as a divine calling.
2. To instruct the student in the teachings and practices of the Mennonite Brethren and Krimmer Mennonite Brethren Churches, to encourage young men and women to make a personal commitment to Christ, to develop leadership, to consecrate time and talent for service within the Church, and to promote world missions.
3. To create a desire within the student to search for truth in the Scriptures, in God's creation, and in the experiences of the human race.
4. To develop general competence in discovering and evaluating facts, theories, and philosophies in the basic areas of human knowledge.
5. To provide the student with knowledge of social problems and cultures, to cultivate a right balance between social privileges and responsibilities, and to stimulate him to assume a Christian role as a democratic citizen in society.
6. To discover and develop student abilities and to enable the student to fully express his particular interests and abilities in society.
7. To understand, create, and enjoy literature, art, music, and other cultural activities as an expression of personal and social experience concomitant with Christian principles.
8. To stimulate the students to achieve competence in social, physical, and scientific skills; and to emphasize honesty and thoroughness in all efforts.

APPENDIX II

An Evaluation of Tabor College

The Study include the following points, each to be marked in one of the categories: not at all, very little, considerably, much, or very much.

I. Tabor College has: (1) helped me to live a more consistent Christian life; (2) helped me to find my particular field of service; (3) helped me to understand historic Christianity better; (4) helped me to realize that one can serve God in any respectable vocation.

II. Tabor Collge has: (5) helped me to understand and be loyal to the M.B. and K.M.B. churches; (6) taught me to see the Christian life as discipleship; (7) helped me to develop ability for leadership in the church; (8) inspired me to serve in some project of the church.

III. Tabor College has: (9) helped me to study the Bible more intelligently; (10) helped me to appreciate and understand the physical and biological world bettr; (11) caused me to become more interested in world affairs and the people of the world; (12) stimulated me in the quest for truth.

15. Tabor College has: (13) helped me to think more honestly, clearly, and constructively; (14) helped me to understand and evaluate the thoughts of others better; (15) helped me to read more critically and intelligently; (16) helped me to formulate and express my ideas better.

V. Tabor College has: (17) made me more aware of the social problems in the world; (18) made me more friendly towards other peoples and races; (19) caused me to take a greater interest in civic affairs, such as community welfare and voting; (20) taught me to treasure my democratic freedom, but not at the expense of others.

VI. Tabor College has: (21) helped me to understand myself: my capacities and limitations; (22) given me the desire and means to develop my particular interests; (23) given me, or is giving me, adequate basic training for the work I intend to do; (24) given me self-confidence.

VII. Tabor College has: (25) helped me to appreciate good music; (26) helped me to appreciate art; (27) given me the necessary background to evaluate literature, art and music; (28) stimulated me to participate in cultural activities.

VIII. Tabor College has: (29) helped me to feel more at ease in company; (30) made me more mindful of proper health habits; (31) helped me become more systematic and thorough in my work; (32) helped me become more honest in all situations of life.

Mennonite Brethren Bible College, Winnipeg, Man. FRANK C. PETERS

THE COMMANDER

Conrad Ferdinand Meyer, the eminent nineteenth century writer of historical fiction, had planned to write a novel about the Reformation in his native Switzerland at various time in his active career. It was intended to be a definitive presentation of this movement in all its historical relationships. The entire age of transition, with its diverse esthetic-ethical interests was to be the backdrop for the emergence of modern man. Meyer hoped to show the triumphal march of human kind, in spite of the inevitable failures along the way.

The German writer had hoped to picture his hero as a noble, refined, "almost heavenly character," a representative of purity, justice, and conscientiousness. By his side were to stand Zwingli, the reckless man of action unafraid to use earthly, impure means to reach his goals, and Conrad Grebel, the Anabaptist enthusiast. Although the author made four attempts, he failed to find the necessary vehicle for such a noble theme.

Of these four ventures only one substantial fragment remains, the opening scene, which the following brief narrative explains:

The Commander, the hero of the story, rebukes his friend Zwingli, because he has ruthlessly ordered the liquidation of a political opponent. This Commander was Conrad Schmid von Küssnacht, the last ruler of the local house of the Knights of St. John, who had accepted the new faith and who later died with Zwingli in the tragic Battle of Kappell in 1531. The beggar along the wayside seems to have been Conrad Grebel.

This brief argument is here translated for the first time from the German.

THE COMMANDER

AUREA

A Novel

A pale young man, with sharp, noble features, wearing the long coat and cap of the predicants, rode on a dust-covered black horse across the lower bridge into the city of Zürich. The traces of courtly fashions in his clothing, the harness of the horse as well as the insignia of the Knights of St. John on the saddle blanket all betrayed the rider as a spiritual knight secularized by the Reformation. The Commander wore an artfully wrought golden crucifix on his breast; all about him on walls and buildings were the visible traces of the abhorred emblems of the cross.

Suddenly the people in the streets rushed toward the square before the Zürich city hall as if some unexpected, but highly exciting spectacle were taking place there. The unpleasant, almost greedy expressions of the market women who had left their baskets behind on the bridge without thought of protecting them, the frantic haste of the school youth toward the square showed that something uncommon, bloody and horrible was to be seen. The Commander, his Golden Cross indicating his rank, avoided the mob and sent but a brief look across the multitude lined deep on the street. As he directed his horse across the steep market street he saw tumultuous activity. A man with knightlike dignity was just ascending the scaffold. For a moment he seemed to want to speak a last word to the witnesses of his execution. Then, visibly, he changed his mind. Over his proud face came an expression of despisal of life rather than of men; this was immediately replaced by his customary mien of genuine piety.

With outstretched finger he drew a sign of the cross on the floor of the bloody structure and knelt upon it. The Commander now had turned his own face away and did not see the head falling; neither did he see a beggar standing close in front of him, upon whose face was pictured such tragic horror, like that of an Orestes in sight of the furies.

The Commander rode through the city and left it by the Stadelhof gate. Lost in thought he let his horse saunter along. And so, he said to himself: Zwingli sent me to Bern on inconsequential matters. He did wisely; with God and my conscience I would not have permitted this bloody injustice. How is it possible? Escher, the unscrupulous lawyer, ten times more guilty, frees himself by lying, and Grebel, this proud, upright man, has to die bcause he refuses subterfuge. He had accepted pensions from foreign princes. He alone? Hundreds with him. Yesterday it was still permitted; today it is forbidden. Close limitations. And how many interdicts are here broken without punishment, if the lawless one flatters the passions of the day instead of warring against them. That's the Republic. Here, however, the Commander, pursuing his train of thought, felt himself transgressing the accepted boundaries. He considers instead, Zwingli, with a feeling flattering and still contradictory, a feeling arising out of the deepest friendship for this man and at the same time out of the inner repulsion for certain of his characteristics. Struggling with his emotions, the Commander now sought escape by looking out over the landscape. But, behold—lupus in fabula—he looks at the face known among thousands by its forceful expression, its lively eyes, its stubby nose, its energetic mouth and obstinate chin; in short, by its historical coinage, he recognizes the face of the Zürich Reformer, Ulrich Zwingli.

Zwingli, who had sought the open country perhaps to escape the gory spectacle in which he possibly was involved, fell in line with the Commander and addressed him with a certain merriment not indicated by his sharp, inquisitive glance.

"Hello, Commander, you permit your horse to saunter? Are you in love? Indeed! Take down your cross and we congratulate you. When is the wedding to be?"

The face of the Commander darkened and a deep line around his mouth became visible; Zwingli seemed to fear it.

"I congratulate you not," the Commander replied, ignoring his friend's untimely joke, "on this new act of force, which you have given history to record. The beheading of Grebel will come to stand upon the same leaf with the drowning of the Anabaptists. It will be inscribed: 'Huldrici Zwingli iniquates crudelitates et diversa facinora.' "

With that he leaped lightly from his horse, and guiding it by the reins he walked with his friend on the narrow street which now ran along the edge of a hill high above the charming blue lake waters, resting in the laziness of the late summer evening.

Zwingli answered quietly, for his was a calm nature, not easily ruffled.

"So I am guilty of everything that is happening here." He pointed backwards toward the city. "In the laws, in the judicial judgments, in the sentences and their execution?"

"Surely," retorted the Commander sharply and with irritation; "haven't you rid yourself in the council and court of every man who maintained a glimmer of independent judgment? This seems to be the fashion with you great men. You have planted a whole forest of creatures around you. Your council, that is the council of your honorable city—where is there in this world a more complete collection of ninnies? Your Burgomaster, Walder—the most splendid simpleton! Your council secretary,

Beiel, with the face of a dilapidated slipper who calls himself your 'serf,' writes such a preacher's style that the men of Bern who know how to rule have begged for a shorter, more adept treatment. Yes, if it were a question of adultery. Beiel in his former office developed a daring phantasy! Your commander-in-chief, Lavater, the handsomest man and the greatest ass in our canton! I anticipate how he will be knocked flat by the five cantons, when war with them breaks out—a war, incidentally, of which you are dreaming by night and laboring by day. Uli! Naturally you do not expect to lose your popularity. All blame for the defeat will be put upon Gödlin and a certain nobleman. Your creatures all know how to win the favor of the people, and that is the only thing they do know. I still recall the time, you well remember, Uli, when your enemies or a few midnight ruffians smashed your window panes. Your general is a glass-maker, quite appropriately. Instead of sending his apprentice to the battlefield of your broken panes, he appears in person, loads your windows upon his shoulders and walks with them haughtily like a conquering landsknecht through the city; henceforth he is a popular man. What do I insinuate? In short, you, Ulrich Zwingli, rule this noble Turicum uncontestedly. A sign from you—Grebel would be alive. You have allowed it to happen—therefore you are guilty!"

He drew a breath. Zwingli, as if released by the Commander's exaggerated estimate of his omnipotence and guilt, was silent, perhaps thinking that his friend would destroy his ill humor and anger by his excited talk and abuse.

"And why did you let this crime happen, Uli? Not because of the old nobleman, but because you were touching and punishing in the father the son whom you hate, Conrad, the mutual friend of your youth."

"That's not so," replied Zwingli with conviction.

"It is so," retorted the Commander, "even if you yourself don't know it, because like all healthy people, you don't know yourself, Uli, and you deny the existence of the hatred which in the course of your struggling life has found refuge within your breast. You hate Conrad like no other. I only wish you could see yourself in the mirror, in contrast to the face of your youth—this protruding jaw, this hard, grim mouth. And yet it was you who pushed Conrad in the critical hour of his life upon the road of caprice, of wrong, of subversive revolution. He was no political anarchist, not even an Anabaptist or visionary, but spiritually and bodily a homeless and embittered youth.

"He envied me," Zwingli interposed, with a smile.

"Perhaps," the Commander continued with irritation. "Why not? Was it pleasing to him, the patrician, to see his own town governed by a cowboy from Toggenburg? You, the leading citizen, should have understood that because you flattered nobility so cringingly in the educational manual dedicated to your stepson, Meyer von Knonau. Why did you not give Conrad, who was fit for it, the professorship of Greek? He promised with a handclasp not to interfere with your reforms, and the trial could have been made. Do you think I do not understand people of your nature? Destroy what stands in the way, grind it to dust, exterminate! All of you are thus, you conquerors and reformers, you seducers of the people, you despots!"

"And all this for a man, so undistinguished and insignificant," mused the Reformer. Now a mortal anger flashed in the deep blue eyes of the Commander. Turning toward Zwingli, he became aware of a beggar who, quite near, was drinking from a little fountain in the shadow of an enormous oak, dipping his deathly pale lips into the bright beam of water.

His flowing, near-white hair over the sipping lips left uncovered only his finely curved nose and lowered eyelash. Had it not been for his slender, slight figure, the face of the beggar might have been that of a sixty-year-old. Catching sight of him, the Commander in great surprise turned on his heels and accompanied Zwingli on the winding road; there he took leave of him with a tone filled with strange nostalgia and longing.

"Love quarrels. Confess! Uli, it was not nice to send me to Bern for some theological bagatelle, because you feared my objection. The old man, Grebel, had forfeited his head, of course, according to the civil law. But, spilling his blood, you have failed against the divine justice which is also called mercy. Transeat cum ceteris erroribus. (May it pass with the other mistakes.) Do you know what? Tomorrow evening come to the headquarters for a bowl of soup, a pike, and a drink of Wangensbach wine. We shall talk in the coolness of the evening; you stay overnight with me, and in the early hours of the morning, you may return to your Great Minster church. Will you?"

Zwingli nodded, and they parted.

When the Commander mounted his horse again and rode past the oak and the fountain, no beggar was to be seen, neither there, nor in the bushes, nor on the roads round about.

Wooster, Ohio WILLIAM I. SCHREIBER

MENNONITE PLATTDEUTSCH

Plattdeutsch (Plautdietsch) is a Low German dialect spoken in the "flat" North German areas. It was adopted by the Mennonites, largely from the Netherlands, who settled in Danzig and along the Vistula River, whence they spread into Russia and North and South America.

Dutch Background. When the Mennonites from the Netherlands settled along the Vistula, they adhered to their Dutch language until the second half of the 18th century. Individuals of different backgrounds joining the Mennonites simply learned this foreign language. The native language of the country was a form of Plattdeutsch with peculiar local characteristics, spoken in some form in all of North Germany. It is linguistically related to Dutch and English. That the similarities between Low German, Dutch, and English are in some respects greater than those between Low German and High German, the official language of German-Speaking countries, can be seen in the word for water: Dutch *water,* Low German *woata,* and High German *Wasser.* Until the 17th century it was a literary language. Whereas Dutch has remained a literary language, most of the Low German dialects are now colloquial languages, although there is a large body of Low German literature, and the dialect has been used by some of the great writers. A current classification divides the Low German language and dialects by the following geographical areas: Westphalia, Hanover, Oldenburg, Bremen, Hamburg, Lübeck, Holstein, Mecklenburg, Pomerania, Braunschweig, Brandenburg, West Prussia, and East Prussia. Most of these areas or countries have many local dialect forms.

From Dutch to Low and High German. Although the Mennonites of this area lived at times under Polish sovereignty, they were little influenced by the Polish language. In their daily life they accepted the Low German spoken in their territory. The question has been raised why the

Mennonites in America coming from Russia and Poland speak different forms of Low German. Some scholars have pointed out that this is related to their religious background such as the Flemish or Frisian church affiliations (Quiring). Others consider it due to the different localities in Danzig and West Prussia from which they moved to Russia (Mitzka). The Mennonites accepted the Low German of their environment gradually, at times retaining some Dutch peculiarities. Mitzka has pointed out that some of the notebooks of Mennonite farmers of the 17th and 18th centuries contain a mixture of Dutch and German. This was the time when they were becoming more and more exposed to the German culture and language. C. Wiens, in his study of the Dutch linguistic influence on the vocabulary of this area, has shown that the shift from Dutch to Low German in daily life was completed before Dutch was replaced by High German in worship services, correspondence, etc. In rural areas this change in worship services was completed earlier than in cities like Danzig. Some ministers, e.g., Buhler in the Grosswerder, began to preach in German in 1757, although the congregation did not like it. In 1762 the first German sermon was preched in the Mennonite church of Danzig, for which the minister received special permission, but no appreciation was expressed. The last elder to insist on Dutch preaching in Danzig was Hans van Steen, who died in 1781. The Danzig church record was henceforth kept in German (in Bethel College Historical Library). The first German Mennonite hymnal replacing the Dutch was printed in 1761. In 1788, when the first Mennonites migrated to Russia, some were still using Dutch. Dutch Bibles and other books were taken along to Russia, some of which even reached the prairie states and provinces of the United States and Canada during the migration of 1874. However, the first migrants to Russia, coming from the poorer classes of the Danzig and Elbing area and settling at Chortitza, primarily spoke Low German. Dutch was no longer in use and High German was still a foreign tongue. It is particularly this form of Low German which has been perpetuated among the more conservative Mennonites of Manitoba and Mexico, and which has been investigated by such scholars as Quiring and Lehn.

Those Mennonites who stayed in Danzig and West Prussia longer followed the prevalent trend, accepting High German more fully for worship services and literary intercourse. Better education, particularly among the more well-to-do, hastened this development. In 1803, when the Molotschna settlement was established in the Ukraine, the new settlers, being a little more prosperous, had made a greater shift from Dutch to Low German as well as to High German. Also the Low German spoken by them had been considerably altered by High German influences. The difference between the Chortitza and Molotschna Low German is still discernible in the settlements of North and South America. There was, however, a general tendency in Russia toward accepting this "more cultured" form of Low German in the areas where Mennonites from both settlements were mixed, such as in secondary schools, forestry service camps, daughter settlements, and especially in the North and South American settlements, where a mixing of various backgrounds has taken place on an unprecedented scale. Among those Mennonites who left Danzig and Prussia in 1850-80, going to Samara (Russia), Nebraska, and Kansas, the shift from Low to High German had almost been completed before the emigration. In the home the parents spoke mostly High German, but knew Low German well enough to converse with servants and those who preferred it. Their High German, to be sure, retained some characteristics

of their Low German background. This phenomenon was true of many of the Mennonites of Prussia up to the time of their dispersion in 1945. At that time Low German was still spoken by the non-Mennonite population, especially by the laboring and poorer classes, in the Prussian communities from which Mennonites had gone to Russia and America, and in which Mennonites still resided. Mitzka, who made a study of the Low German spoken by the Mennonites of Russia and the areas from which they originally came in West Prussia, states that a geographic shift of the Low German had taken place in their home country.

Low German in America. In the great Mennonite migration from Russia to North America in 1874 the Chortitza or Old Colony Mennonites went to Manitoba and later some to Mexico and South America. They have preserved the original Plattdeutsch in its purest form, although it also shows Russian and English influences. They have only a very limited mastery of High German and English, and in Mexico and South America of Spanish. The Molotschna Mennonites went primarily to the United States, settling in Kansas, Nebraska, the Dakotas, and Minnesota, although some settled in Manitoba. Mennonites from Poland settled in Kansas and Dakota. The Low German of the Polish group differs more from that of the Molotschna and Chortitza than these do between themselves. The Molotschna Mennonites did not all speak the same form of Low German, nor had they lived together long enough to achieve complete uniformity. The later Molotschna settlements, such as Waldheim and Alexanderwohl, had very definite linguistic characteristics which have been retained and are even today noticeable in Kansas.

Russian and English Influences. Gerhard Wiens' study of the influences of the Russian language on the Plattdeutsch of the Mennonites makes some startling observations: "This study of mine may indeed shock some of my people," their Low German "was not nearly so pure as we were proud to claim." He presents examples of how new words were introduced from the new environment and assimilated, how Russian neologisms entered and Low German words were given a Russian form. Quiring also made a study of Polish and Russian influences on Low German, while C. Wiens has done similar work on Dutch influences on Low German. J. John Friesen and J. W. Goerzen have pointed out the relationships between Plattdeutsch and English. No one has fully investigated the influence of the English language on the Low German in Canada and the United States, or the Spanish and Portuguese on the Low German in Mexico and South America, although such influences are noticeable.

Among the Mennonite groups of Russian background in the United States, Low German is still spoken or understood in solid Mennonite communities such as Goessel, Buhler, Inman, and Hillsboro in Kansas, Henderson in Nebraska, and Mountain Lake in Minnesota. However, by far not all the young people are able to converse in Low German. It can be expected that Low German will gradually disappear within a few generations among the Mennonites in the United States, but will likely remain in use for some time to come in Canada and particularly in Mexico and South America where the bearers of this language are living in much greater isolation. A Plattdeutsch religious radio program has been broadcast over CFAM in Altona, Man., by the Mennonite Radio Mission since 1957, and another at Swift Current, Sask. During World War II, when the use of the High German was not permitted, the Mennonites of Brazil used Low German in worship services. The Old Colony Mennonite ministers frequently change from High to Low German since many of the

young people understand very little High German. Many of the Indians living in the vicinity of the Chaco Mennonites in Paraguay speak some Low German. Thus far the studies dealing with the Low German as spoken by the Mennonites have been devoted primarily to synchronic, diachronic, and phonetic investigations (Quiring, Goerzen, Lehn). Only few attempts (Mitzka) have been made to trace the origin, spread, and differences among the various Low German dialect forms spoken by Mennonites, their relation to each other, as well as the structural development of each.

There is a noticeable culturally restrictive effect of the continued use of the dialect, particularly in groups where the isolation from the main stream of German or English culture is marked. Most of those who speak Low German as their major language read parctically no literature, since there is very little modern Low German literature available, especially of a religious character.

The Low German and Pennsylvania German languages have been used by the conservative Mennonites and Amish as barriers against "worldly" influences. Like other forms of nonconformity, such as dress restrictions, they have been at times a positive and at times a negative factor in the development of a wholesome Mennonite church and community life.

Low German Mennonite Literature. Among the Mennonites of Russia, J. H. Janzen was the first to write Low German plays. They were primarily designed to be given in schools and deal particularly with questions pertaining to education. He continued his writing in Canada and was succeeded by Arnold Dyck, who wrote *Dee Fria,* a comedy, *"Wellkaom op'e Forstei!"* and a number of other Low German plays and numerous narratives and short stories, such as *Koop enn Bua op Reise; Koop enn Bua faore nao Toronto; Die Millionäa von Kosefeld;* and *Onse Lied.* These plays are still being given in Mennonite communities of North and South America where Low German is spoken. This is generally the case in Canada, Mexico, Brazil, and Paraguay.

(Taken from Volume IV of the *Mennonite Encyclopedia,* to appear in 1959, where a complete bibliography is found.)

Bethel College CORNELIUS KRAHN

The Political and Social Doctrines of the Unity of the Czech Brethren in the Fifteenth and Early Sixteenth Centuries. By Peter Brock. 'S-Gravenhage: Mouton & So., 1957., Pp. 302, F 24.

Between Community and Society. A Philosophy and Theology of the State. By Thomas Gilby. London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1953. Pp. 344, 255.

The justification of a joint review for these very diverse books lies in the fact that they represent the opposite poles in the inner dialectic of Western Christian history. The study in the Czech Brethren movement, on the one hand, illustrates the prophetic and redemptive impulse of the Christian faith which erupts to create the Christian movement in the first place, and then repeatedly so to renew a declining church. Gilby's study on Thomas Aquinas, on the other hand, illustrates the conserving and harmonizing impulse which draws its nourishments more particularly from the doctrine of creation. In the former type the ties of the Christian community to society and culture are often denied or broken, both to its own impoverishment and the forfeiture of its universal mission. In the latter type the universal embrace leads to the loss of the eschatological and rdemptive thrust. This bifurcation of Christian reality leads to (the) Reformation and schism. Placed side by side, how do Thomas Aquinas, the greatest representative of the vision of equilibrium rather than of cleavage, and Peter Chelcicky, perhaps the first dissenter from Thomas's *corpus christianum* to carry his dissent to a radical and systematic conclusion, appear? The comparison will have to be made in the mind of the reader of the two works, of course, since the studies as such have no relationship to each other.

The appearance of Peter Brock's revised Ph.D. thesis (Oxford) as the first complete and scholarly study of the early Czech Brethren movement in English is an important event, not merely in its own right, but also because of its bearing on the whole field of "left wing" Reformation research. For early in the modern stirrings in Anabaptist historiography Ludwig Keller had put forward the thesis of the descent of the Anabaptist movement from groups like the Czech Brethren and the Waldensians. The evidence that he could muster was not convincing, especially after the details of the origins of the Anabaptists in Switzerland became more clearly known.

Brock concurs with contemporary Anabaptist scholars in holding the independent origin of the Czech Brethren and Anabaptism, and his study reveals no evidence of direct dependence in point of origin. But the clear picture which emerges of Peter Chelcicky's views and of their eventual embodiment after his death in the Czech Brethren movement, all so similar to the Anabaptist movement which was to arise a few decades later, cannot but raise anew the question how this similarity came about. How is that in the three divergent areas of Bohemia, Switzerland, and the Netherlands there emerged three virtually identical yet independent movements in the space of a single lifetime (or a whole century, if we go back to the beginning of Chelcicky's work), all expressing the same critique of European Christendom? Is it enough to argue the relative homogeneity of Europan civilization at the time, and the perennial validity of the concepts underlying these movements, or even to the fresh action of the Holy Spirit? In any case, one can find in the quite original work of Chelcicky, as well as in the ensuing movement, a rehearsal of all the posi-

tions and arguments on both sides of the question of church-society relations which were to arise in the controversy over the Anabaptist movement. Brock's study is limited, however, to social and political matters. A full theological study would no doubt reveal important difference between the two movements. For example, since the Unity was an outgrowth of the Hussite movement and the Utraquist controversy, the sacramental points of contention were the Eucharist and ordination rather than baptism. It is known too that at a certain point antitrinitarian views gained at least some entree.

Most interesting in this connection are the two major treatises, *O trojlm lidu* and *Sit' prave viry*. One can only hope that they will sometime appear in a West European translation. Like a Pilgrim Marpeck, Chelcicky does astoundingly original work without the advantages of formal theological training. Indeed, Brock speculates, it was precisely this freedom from scholastic strictures which may have enabled him to work in a fresh and unfettered way. Chelcicky relies chiefly on the Bible, with minor references to the Church Fathers, works all his life as a farmer, and is thus virtually a "philosopher in retirement." Within this context Chelcicky erects, as Brock says, "one of the most powerful indictments of the state as an institution, as well as of the abuses of contemporary society." All the classic Anabaptist arguments are in it— Constantine (Pope Sylvester is the culprit), the distinction between the testaments, the necessity of the state in fallen society, the call of the Christian community to live otherwise, repudiation of social class and economic inequalities, etc.

What makes this study doubly instructive, however, is the story it tells of the "sect cycle." At first there is merely the familiar conflict with the established church, with some similarity to the Zürich Reformation, where the opponent is the old church in a compromising act of self-reformation. Very quickly, however, the accommodation of the Unity to surrounding "realities" begins, and a schism occurs which in time is nothing other than a re-enactment of the mass church *vs* sect conflict within the sect, even on the point of a majority-minority relationship. All this occurs within three decades of the founding of the movement. In the end, as a nineteenth Catholic scholar, Gindely, pointed out with reference to the Major party, "Indeed, they say nothing but what the church has long been saying to its believers."

In the matter of historiography, the fate of the movement was similar to that of Anabaptism, even down to the point of Marxist interest in its founders. Since the communist revolution in Czechoslovakia some effort has been made to interpret Chelcicky somewhat as Thomas Müntzer is being interpreted by Marxist writers in Russia and East Germany. But already in the nineteenth century various Slavic writers took note of Chelcicky's political views. The whole story is an interesting chapter in the history of ideas when one notes his influence on Tolstoy, and in turn, Tolstoy's influence on Gandhi. For most of the readers of these columns, including this reviewer, Brock's study is not an easy one. Sources, names, and events belong to a world which, chiefly for reasons of language, we unfortunately know all too little.

A movement as that of the Unity of the Czech Brethren ought not to be studied without keeping constantly in mind the beautiful architectonic vision of medieval Christendom, whose theoretical perfecter, of course, was Thomas Aquinas. In Thomas Gilby, presumably one of the English Black Friars, the other Thomas has an interpreter who moves over his works with the same urbanity and sculptured harmony of thought. Basing his usage of the terms "community" and "society" in some measure

on the works of the London sociologist Morris Ginsberg, Gilby sets forth the Thomist philosophy and theology of the state. The picture is an appealing one and, granting certain premises, one can understand why a Jamques Maritain should have concluded on discovering Aquinas that thenceforth he could do no other than to "Thomasize."

Our usual picture of the medieval order shows it to be conservative and at rest. But Thomas is far too astute a thinker to hold such a view himself. Actually he seeks to avoid the two pitfalls which always beset us in social thought: either to think of social facts as "things," as somehow possessing substance apart from or beyond the participating people, or of thinking purely in individualistic or existential terms. If Gilby is right, Thmoas was able to avoid any dilemma in this matter, and he beheld them as "one single flow of historic reality." It would be helpful to have these ideas fully translated into contemporary sociological jargon, though admittedly it would also be confusing. But there is good ground to conclude, on reading this study, that many of the things now "new" in the social sciences are new only in jargon and in the statistics with which they bristle, but not in insight.

We can draw attention here to only one phase of Gilby's study, and this has to do with the relationship of nature and eschatology. It seems to this reviewer that here is the heart of the problem which eventually breaks the Christian community into church and sect, and a comparison of Aquinas and Chelcicky makes the issues clear. Where the world view of the former moves on the plane of nature or creation, the latter moves on the plane of redemptive realities . While each naturally also upholds the other doctrine, yet at the point of historical commitment, these are the contrasting premises on which they work. Thomas can hardly be gainsaid in his view that grace does nothing to impair nature. As a practical result of his view, however, grace can hardly challenge "nature." The state, with all its attributes including its military arm, is rooted in nature for Thomas, while Chelcicky characteristically sees it, as did Augustine before him, as somehow originating in the fallen order. Thus while for Thomas grace may curb a runaway nature—wars may be fought only when they are just, though he arrives at even this insight without necessary recourse to grace—Chelcicky sees in grace a radical challenge to those traits of the fallen order which contradict grace, even though they may seem "natural."

This means, as Gilby cautiously suggests, that in a dialectic scheme, Aristotle might be regarded as the thesis, Augustine the antithesis, and Thomas the synthesis. Or, for our present purpose, we might suggest with similar caution that in Thomas nature (creation) is the major premise, grace the minor premise, and his vision of Christendom the conclusion. As far as the practical results are concerned, for Chelcicky the order is reversed, as it is for the Anabaptists. Thus where the former concludes with a unified field of historical reality, the latter ends with a permanent historical cleavage (only relative, of course) between nature and grace. But Thomas's synthesis is a moving equilibrium, including both nature and grace, both Aristotle and Augustine, and it is this dynamic synthesis which makes him so suitable a foundation for modern Catholicism and so perennially satisfying to a certain type of philosopher.

But what happens? One looks in vain in Gilby, and presumably in Thomas, for anything approaching the crucial role assigned in the New Testament to the church as the new people of God which becomes the central vehicle of historical meaning. In his scheme, of course, there stands over against the human mass with its "racial, tribal, and family

outgrowths," "the spiritual association, the exemplar of all human relationships and the end to which they fumble," between which oscillates the state as a work of art. But this "spiritual association" seems more like a Platonic idal than an eschatological but historically gathered people of God. As a practical result, while the church as institution carries on her sacramental work and certainly performs certain work as a moral preceptress, the affairs of this world are left to operate according to this-worldly laws, de spite the corruption of the existent order. In the end grace goes conservative, thus abetting the status quo rather than challenging and transforming it. Even the forward thrust is secularized, and it is only a matter of time until God can be replaced in the scheme of things by resident forces, and the eschatological pull from above is fully replaced by a Darwinian urge from below. Meanwhile we have left Thomas far behind, and so he need not be accused of it all. But one grace becomes a minor premise in the Christian scheme of things, how can the outcome be otherwise?

And where do find Chelcicky? By the beginning of the sixteenth century the cycle is already complete, and the Major party have "gone over to the world" in their views, if not in their affiliation to the established church, while within the half century the conservative Minor party has died out. The whole process makes dismal reading for any "sect" which has reached the "rethinking" stage. That is, the moment the eschatological expectancy, the sense of immediacy in the coming rule of Christ, is lost, accommodation as rapidly as it is psychologically possible is the only recourse. Since the psychological resistance of individuals and of groups varies greatly, the way back is likely to be beset by recurrent controversy, if not schism, as to when and where the next accommodating step may be permitted.

Something is missing. When *Christendom* loses its eschatology, in time it may lose even its theology of creation. And when the sect loses its doctrine of creation, in time it loses relevance in its message of grace. The question, of course, is not the gnostic one of whether the God of creation is identical with the God of grace. That He is one, in this Christendom and the sect agree. But where in the premise of the former the two are woven into a single cloth, in the view of the latter, human freedom and sin being what they are, an historical tension is inescapable. But is the church and sect dichotomy inherent in the nature of things? If so, should we not expect to find it adumbrated in the Gospel, as Troeltsch assumes? Or do the church and the sect still claim, each in its own way and in itself to be the full embodiment of redemption? Rome, of course, makes that claim, and one can usually find a few sects who do (and here I use the term theologically rather than sociologically as heretofore), but what of the multitudes who oscillate between them? Better read Gilby and Brock.

Tokyo, Japan PAUL PEACHEY